Spring 2018

Teaching And Learning Pragmatics And Speech Acts: An Instructional Pragmatics Curriculum Development Project For EFL Learners

Bridget Borer
Hamline University

TEACHING AND LEARNING PRAGMATICS AND SPEECH ACTS:

AN INSTRUCTIONAL PRAGMATICS CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

FOR EFL LEARNERS

by

Bridget Maureen Borer

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in English as a Second Language

Hamline University

St. Paul, Minnesota

May, 2018

Primary Advisor: Patty Born Selly
Content Advisor: Anne DeMuth
Peer Reviewers: Erin Mullin and Mya Shaftel

This capstone project is wholeheartedly dedicated to the memory of my first child and oldest son, Philip Charles Borer Nelson, who was a teacher to me and many others from the very moment of his birth until his untimely death.

We are not born human in any but a biological sense; it is only by immersion in the "ocean of language and dialogue" fed by the springs of cultural tradition that we can learn to know ourselves and others and thus learn the ways of being human.
-Daisaku Ikeda

I offer a very special thank you to Letitia Basford and Joe Lewis for all of their encouragement and support over the past several years and especially the past few months. The gratitude I feel is immeasurable.

Thank you also to Mike Reynolds, Anne DeMuth, Patty Born Selly, Mya Shaftel and Erin Mullin for helping me through the final phases of this capstone project.

And thank you to my family, especially my younger son, Jordan, who has overcome so much and continues to be brave and loving every day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The Topic and Project 8

Overview of the Chapter 8

My Journey into the Realm of Pragmatics 9

A Focus on Pragmatics When Learning a Second Language 10

A Curriculum Development Project for Learning Pragmatics 11

Speech Act Theory 12

Interlanguage and Interlanguage Pragmatics 13

Instructional Pragmatics 14

Conventional Forms of Instruction with Pragmatics 14

Explicit Instruction 17

Culturally Relevant Collaborative Learning 17

Summary 18

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction 20

Pragmatics 21

Implicature 22

Presupposition 23

Deixis 24

Reference 24

Speech Acts 25

Representatives 26

Directives 26

Commissives 26

Declarations 27

Expressives 27

Indirect Speech Acts 27

Context and Speech Acts 29

Apologizing as an Expressive Speech Act 30

Interlanguage 34

Interlanguage Pragmatics 35

Pragmatic Competence 36

Pragmalinguistic Competence 37

Sociopragmatic Competence 37

Instructional Pragmatics 38

Exposure versus Instruction 40

Implicit and Explicit Instruction 41

The EFL Environment and Learner 44

Project Rationale 48

Summary 49

CHAPTER THREE: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction 51

Overview of the Project 52

Project Framework 53

Teaching Methodologies 54

The EFL Setting for Instruction in Pragmatics 59

The EFL Learner as Audience for Instruction in Pragmatics 60

Project Description, Course Design, and Timeline for Units/Lessons 63

Summary 67

CHAPTER FOUR: CRITICAL REFLECTION

Introduction 68

What I Have Learned 69

The Literature Review 71

Implications for Research and Project 73

Limitations of this Curriculum Project 74

Future Projects and Recommendations 75

Benefits to English Language Learning 77

Summary 77

References 79

Appendix A: Sample of Lesson Design Template 91

Appendix B: Sample of Course Syllabus 92

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Topic and Project

The intent of this capstone project is the advancement of instructional pragmatics as a component of interlanguage pragmatic development. More specifically, the focus is on operationalizing instructional pragmatics in an English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching and learning environment in order to enhance the pragmatic competence of adult English learners (ELs) when performing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English. The following question best iterates this undertaking: What might an instructional pragmatics curriculum for adult EFL learners look like? This curriculum development project is designed as a speaking skills course consisting of several lessons for intermediate to advanced level ELs in an EFL environment using research-based instructional techniques focused on improving interlanguage pragmatic competence when producing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English.

Overview of the Chapter

In this chapter I explain my interest in the subject of pragmatics. I also discuss my reason for doing a curriculum development project intended to enhance the pragmatic competence of adult EFL learners and in turn improve their overall communicative competence. I briefly address teaching pragmatics in relation to three important components of pragmatics research which are Speech Act Theory, interlanguage pragmatics, and instructional pragmatics. I explain some of the more conventional forms

of EFL instruction and how integrating pragmatics is useful. I also briefly address what it means to teach pragmatics explicitly and how this is beneficial. In addition, I include an explanation for how culturally relevant, collaborative learning enhances instruction. I then summarize the chapter and give a brief overview of chapters two, three, and four.

My Journey into the Realm of Pragmatics

I was first interested in the subject of pragmatics while taking a linguistics course for English teachers. In that course I learned that pragmatics as a level of linguistics can be defined as the study of language in context, including any context where language is used. Pragmatics goes beyond the sounds, words, or sentences which compose language. Pragmatics involves discourse and related speech acts and the various levels of meaning and perception when a speech act is delivered and received by a speaker and hearer. In comparison to the other levels of linguistics, pragmatics seemed more intangible to me—its parameters more difficult to define since the many contexts where language is used are so broad and varied. Plus, in any discourse situation the number of speech acts and their potential meanings seems endless. The extensiveness of pragmatics and its intersection with language and culture made the subject of pragmatics fascinating to me.

In addition, through the study of pragmatics, I became more aware of the impact that language choices have in our lives, and how these choices are heavily influenced by culture. As a native speaker (NS) of English I realized how I take my home country (USA) and its cultural norms and my everyday usage of English for granted. Through the lens of pragmatics, I more thoroughly appreciated the difficulty that second language (L2) learners have in acquiring culturally appropriate L2 linguistic forms. The struggle to learn a second language with all of its linguistic and sociocultural complexities became

more salient to me. And, as a language teacher, this realization was important in helping me develop more empathy for my students.

A Focus on Pragmatics When Learning a Second Language

When a learner is acquiring their second language, the focus for teaching and learning is often on form and function. This means that the L2 learner studies and learns numerous linguistic forms (words, phrases, sentences, grammatical structures) and is then offered a generalized sense of how they function in commonplace discourse situations. The limitation of this approach is that the context when using a language can vary significantly from moment to moment. Language contexts include many factors such as social roles, social situations and cultural norms. When an L2 learner does not understand the sociocultural norms associated with the L2, mistakes and misunderstandings can ensue. These mistakes or misunderstandings are referred to as pragmatic failures. For example, if an EL ignores or downplays a compliment given to them by a native speaker of English, they might be perceived as being impolite because the generalized cultural norm or expectation for responding to a compliment in English is to acknowledge the compliment and offer some form of thanks. Lack of understanding about the sociocultural norms behind the language can cause unfortunate misperceptions about the L2 learner. Conversational misunderstandings that lead to misperceptions can cause the learner to experience lowered confidence and self-efficacy (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). By focusing on the pragmatics level of linguistics in teaching and learning, the L2 learner can gain a broader sense of target language (TL) form-function-context mappings, which include cultural norms and social rules of discourse. Increased pragmatic knowledge will assist the L2 learner in making

better linguistic and more socially acceptable language choices in real time. Making better choices leads to more success as a user of the language and increases the learner's proficiency, confidence and self-efficacy (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). Consequently, learning about pragmatics, recognizing pragmatic competence as a key language skill, and acquiring pragmatic competence through study and practice is crucial for language learners. Pragmatic competence increases their ability to successfully navigate a variety of social situations, prevent misunderstandings, eliminate misperceptions, and increase overall competence and confidence, which encourages more motivated learning and in turn leads to further L2 development and fluency.

A Curriculum Development Project for Learning Pragmatics

I have chosen to do a curriculum development project with a focus on developing pragmatics instruction for adult EFL learners because I feel it should be an important part of any EFL curriculum. As an EFL teacher, I have noticed how learners sometimes use English language expressions in unusual or inappropriate ways. I have found that it is difficult to explain to students why a phrase that is grammatically correct was used inappropriately. I have attributed some of this difficulty to the paucity of material for teaching and learning pragmatics. I realized that this lack of availability of instructional materials related to pragmatics created limitations for both teachers and learners. It is my hope that a curriculum development project that incorporates authentic and relevant teaching materials for reinforcing pragmatic development will lead to more EFL programs that highlight the importance of pragmatics and make instructional pragmatics a regular curriculum component. This curriculum development project, which employs

the latest instructional pragmatics techniques, specifically focuses on the teaching and learning of one of the most commonly used expressive speech acts, the apology. By practicing the speech act of apologizing, learners will gain insight into how a common speech act in the L2 can be utilized effectively and appropriately in contextualized discourse. Hopefully, this focus on speech acts will inspire new and improved speaking curriculum content in EFL learning environments.

The concept of speech acts is vital to the materialization of instruction in pragmatics. Speech Act Theory is one of three theoretical frameworks underlying the pragmatics curriculum in this project. The other two frameworks are interlanguage pragmatics and instructional pragmatics. In this next section I will briefly explain the basics of these constructs and relate them to this project.

Speech Act Theory

Speech Act Theory categorizes the many ways in which discourse occurs in everyday speech (Cutting, 2008). Some examples of speech acts are greetings and farewells, making requests, accepting or refusing requests, giving compliments and responding to compliments, offering apologies, giving thanks, and so on. The number of speech acts is indeterminable; however, Speech Act Theory suggests that any act of speech can fall into a set number of categories which are defined by Searle (1976) as Representatives, Directives, Commissives, Declarations, and Expressives. For the current project, the focus will be on the expressive speech act of apologizing. Expressive speech acts are viewed as the most emotive speech acts and express a psycho-emotional state (Ronan, 2015). Examples of other Expressives include greeting, thanking, complaining, boasting, congratulating, condoling, and so on. This curriculum project will concentrate on the

conventional routines and strategies for apologizing in English. Apologies have been extensively researched in interlanguage pragmatics literature, so there is more reliable information about their general use.

Interlanguage and Interlanguage Pragmatics

Interlanguage is the language that L2 learners acquire or internalize as they learn a second language and become more proficient in their use of the L2. According to Selinker (as cited in Tarone, 2014), an L2 learner's interlanguage is viewed as a linguistic system all its own that can change with experience and greater proficiency in the target language. Interlanguage pragmatics examines the pragmatic abilities of the L2 learner as they acquire knowledge of the pragmatic norms of the L2. Knowing how to properly greet a stranger, make a request to your boss, give a compliment to your classmate, or apologize to a co-worker for being late are all examples of situations where pragmatic competence is required in order to facilitate harmonious interactions. The language that is used by the L2 learner in an L2 situation is an indication not only of their linguistic knowledge, but also their pragmatic knowledge.

The study of interlanguage pragmatics involves understanding pragmatic development as well as differences in pragmatic norms. Interlanguage pragmatics research reveals that acquiring pragmatic competence in the L2 happens in stages and in conjunction with the acquisition of linguistic forms (Rose, 2000; Rose, 2009). This means that more complex aspects of pragmatic norms are acquired as L2 fluency develops. The research also shows that pragmatic norms are driven by sociocultural norms (Hinkel, 1994; Hinkel, 1996). Although there are universal pragmatic norms shared between languages and cultures, many pragmatic norms are language and culture specific or context specific and

must be acquired through exposure and/or instruction in the L2. Research related to interlanguage pragmatics will guide this project in terms of curriculum content and learner development.

Instructional Pragmatics

Instructional pragmatics is a component of interlanguage pragmatics and its purpose is the development and utilization of the most advantageous teaching methods for improving L2 learners' interlanguage pragmatic competence (Ishihara, 2010; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Vellenga, 2008). Instructional pragmatics is a relatively new field of endeavor; however, the current literature is encouraging because the research demonstrates positive outcomes in learner proficiency when teaching pragmatics as a core curricular component. The latest research involving the most effective instructional pragmatic techniques and methodologies will be operationalized for this project (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

By incorporating Speech Act Theory, interlanguage pragmatics, and instructional pragmatics in this project, I will provide a basis for teaching pragmatics that will be grounded in well-defined language teaching research and pedagogy and can be imitated, further developed, and implemented within a typical EFL program.

Conventional Forms of Instruction with Pragmatics

Based on my experience as an EFL instructor, focusing specifically on teaching pragmatics to EFL learners is not commonplace even though pragmatic knowledge is useful for language learners to acquire. English as a foreign language is usually taught with a focus on pronunciation, vocabulary, and prescriptive grammar, while developing the productive (speaking and writing) and receptive (listening and reading) skills. EFL

instruction employs a range of methodologies that support second language acquisition. These include approaches such as Contrastive Analysis, Noticing/Awareness, Focus on Form, Input/Intake, Ethnography, Controlled Practice and Negative Feedback (Vellenga, 2008). While applying these instruction types, the characteristic teaching and learning goals have been to increase language proficiency in terms of generating more intelligible pronunciation, utilizing more complex grammar structures, broadening lexical range, and raising competency levels for the receptive and productive skills. Through research in pragmatics, it has become more evident that these formulae for instruction can also be effectively used for specifically teaching pragmatics. For example, with Contrastive Analysis, pragmatic norms of the learner's L1 and L2 can be compared and contrasted in the classroom in order to analyze whether norms of the L1 transfer to the L2 or interfere with the L2. With the Noticing/Awareness instructional practice, teaching materials that augment conscious awareness about language use and context can play a strong role in understanding L2 pragmatic norms. Regarding the use of Focus on Form, in pragmatics instruction linguistical forms can be presented within a speech acts framework including multiple functions within different context scenarios. This shift would lead to a form-function-context mapping of the L2. The Input/Intake mode of instruction is highly regarded in EFL speaking lessons where providing comprehensible *input* is a basic requirement for producing *uptake* and acquiring *intake*. By including materials and discussions on pragmatic norms, as well as realistic examples of language in context in the L2, the pragmatics *input* would be heightened and would lead to elevated *intake* of pragmatic understanding. Ethnography in the classroom is associated with the observation and recording of language use and development. When EFL learners are

pragmatics ethnographers, it is beneficial for them to journal speech act observations for both the L1 and L2 in order to analyze and infer how speech acts are routinized according to each language and culture. Controlled Practice involves cognitive processes and memorization through repeated practice. Because there are a vast number of conventionalized speech act routines and phrases, many of them can be learned through practice and memorization. Through explicit instruction in pragmatics, not only could speech act routines and phrases be memorized, but the related contexts in which they are used most frequently could be put to memory as well. This type of instruction is useful especially for beginning learners. Negative Feedback instruction involves actively correcting learners' errors in order to facilitate noticing and awareness and is usually associated with pronunciation, grammatical formulation, or lexical accuracy; however, corrective feedback regarding pragmatic errors can also be provided to L2 learners in the classroom. Similarly, presenting videos to learners depicting real (or realistic) conversations that display pragmatic failures can allow leaners to further examine pragmatic errors and will generate feedback in the form of classroom discussion.

Largely, standard EFL instruction has not included an emphasis on pragmatics and developing pragmatic competence (Ishihara, 2010; Kim, 2016; Lai, 2013). The pragmatics component is usually a residual or secondary factor when teaching forms and their related functions or the reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills. Although the above mentioned approaches to instruction could be utilized to teach pragmatics, this has not been the general situation to date. The aim of this project is to integrate standard EFL teaching practices with explicit instruction and metapragmatic communication to promote the learning of L2 pragmatic norms.

Explicit Instruction

In many language learning environments an emphasis on implicit and/or inductive ("bottom up") teaching is common because it encourages problem solving, student-teacher and student-student interaction, and a more communicative classroom (Parrish, 2006). In language classrooms where communicative competence is the main objective, this approach is invaluable. When teaching pragmatics, research indicates that it is also beneficial to include explicit and/or deductive ("top down") teaching techniques—where instruction includes rich and overt metapragmatic communication (Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2010). Explicit instruction in pragmatics involves using detailed communication about the sociocultural rules and norms of the language being learned. Explicitly communicating the pragmatic norms associated with the L2 is shown to better prepare the L2 learner when faced with making pragmatic choices in the L2 (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003). For this project, an emphasis will be on providing explicit explanations regarding pragmatics and speech acts during instruction in order to help students better understand L2 sociocultural norms and principles of discourse.

Culturally Relevant Collaborative Learning

In recent years, there has been a constructive movement toward identifying and incorporating a culturally relevant framework into English language teaching and learning. In the EFL classroom this entails recognizing and valuing the learner's home culture and its sociocultural norms, especially language-related norms. By comparing and contrasting the pragmatic norms of the L1 to the norms of English-speaking societies, learners can think openly, even critically, about the similarities and differences between the cultures, thereby, subjectively differentiating the norms. Comparing the pragmatic

norms of the learner's L1 to the sociocultural norms of the English-speaking world will add to the explicit understanding of pragmatics (Ishihara, 2006). This project will continue the effort to integrate relevant home culture context into the EFL curriculum by way of teacher-student collaborative talk, critical analysis of language usage, student group discussions, and purposeful languaging within the classroom. The combination of explicit instruction with metapragmatic communication, culturally relevant discourse, and classroom collaborative talk regarding pragmatic norms will be integral to this project as a means of encouraging pragmatic development for adult EFL learners.

Summary

In this introductory chapter, I have presented my topic: the advancement of instructional pragmatics as a component of interlanguage pragmatic development. I have explained the central focus which is operationalizing instructional pragmatics in an EFL teaching and learning environment in order to enhance the pragmatic competence of adult ELs when performing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English. In relation to this topic, I have shared my personal story of how I came to develop an interest in the subject of pragmatics. I have also shared why a curriculum development project with a focus on teaching pragmatics is necessary for developing overall communicative competence for L2 learners. I have briefly described the major research components that will guide the development of my project, which are pragmatics, speech act theory, interlanguage pragmatics, and instructional pragmatics. I have touched on the teaching methodologies that will be used in the project. I have also addressed the importance of including explicit instruction, culturally relevant content, and cross-cultural discussion in the classroom curriculum.

In Chapter Two, I provide a more comprehensive review of the literature regarding pragmatics, Speech Act Theory, interlanguage pragmatics and pragmatic competence, instructional pragmatics, the adult EFL learner and the EFL teaching and learning environment. For Chapter Three, I will describe my project in detail, including a rationale and framework for the project such as the timeline, setting, audience, and teaching appproaches. In Chapter Four, I will reflect on the building and completion of the project and offer insights into the implications for future projects and the possible limitations or improvements needed when attempting similar projects.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The intent of this capstone project is the advancement of instructional pragmatics as a component of interlanguage pragmatic development. More specifically, the focus is on operationalizing instructional pragmatics in an EFL teaching and learning environment in order to enhance the pragmatic competence of adult EFL learners when performing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English. Creating instructional pragmatics curriculums is a newly emerging L2 teaching endeavor. This movement is prompted by research in interlanguage pragmatics showing that pragmatic competence is as crucial as linguistic competence in L2 proficiency (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). The purpose of this project is to develop an instructional pragmatics curriculum that is suitable for an EFL teaching and learning environment. The curriculum for this project combines conventional teaching approaches with explicit instruction and culturally relevant collaborative learning. This curriculum development project is designed as a speaking skills course consisting of several lessons for adult EFL learners. The project relies on research-based instructional pragmatics techniques focused on improving learners' interlanguage pragmatic competence and speaking performance when apologizing in English.

In this chapter I review the most current and relevant literature regarding pragmatics, which is a major component of the study of linguistics, and includes: Speech Act Theory

and expressive speech acts, especially routines and strategies for performing the expressive speech act of apologizing; interlanguage and interlanguage pragmatics and what they mean in terms of acquiring a second language; pragmatic competence and the difference between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence; instructional pragmatics and effective approaches to teaching higher level pragmatic skills; the need for pragmatics instruction in EFL classrooms; and the needs and goals of adult learners in an EFL environment. Finally, I will provide a rationale for how research on these topics is relevant to the current project and how it will enhance the curriculum component of the project.

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is language use in context. Language cannot exist outside of its sociocultural context. Language situations rely heavily on the context involved with each utterance whether it is written or spoken. A working definition of pragmatics is the study of language meaning as it is used in context (Huang, 2014). With this definition in mind, there are two parts of pragmatics, the linguistic or language portion and the context. The linguistic aspect during a discourse event is the actual utterances that occur—the words and their semantic meanings along with grammar or syntax—while the context is the related environment, including any consequential factors at play during the discourse event, such as the people, place, culture, and time.

What are the theoretical components most often considered when studying pragmatics or language use in context? According to Huang (2014), "The central topics of inquiry of pragmatics include implicature, presupposition, speech acts, deixis, and reference (p. 2)." For the purposes of this project, the main focus will be on speech acts which will be

covered more in-depth further on in this review. In order to create a more comprehensive understanding of pragmatics, a brief discussion on the other four topics of inquiry is also required.

Implicature

Implicature, also called inference, involves implied meanings during discourse as opposed to linguistic/semantic or literal meanings. It is often the case that the implied meaning of an utterance is very different and seems unrelated to the linguistic meaning (Huang, 2014). For example, if A asks B "Do you want to go to the movies?" and B says, "I'm not feeling too good," the answer B gave will be understood by A through its implied meaning, which is *No, I do not want to go to the movies because I am not feeling well.* An in-depth analysis of implicature can be attributed to H.P. Grice (1969) who conceptualized the topic of implicature as it relates to meaning with the theories of Conversational Implicature—most meanings within conversations are inferred—as well as the Co-operative Principles. The Co-operative Principles consist of four maxims for co-operative discourse—Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. These principles are considered to be the agreed upon conventions that are ideally operational during discourse (Cutting, 2008; Huang, 2014). The Quantity maxim states that the amount of information during discourse should be proportionate to the situation—not too much, not too little. The maxim of Quality says that discourse should be truthful, honest, and evidential. The Relation maxim suggests that all discourse should be relevant or pertinent. And the Manner maxim suggests that discourse be concise, coherent, orderly, and unambiguous. Obviously, these principles are not always in play during discourse events. Often they are ignored, violated, or flouted. Implicature and the Co-operative

Principles are based on discourse comportments that appear to be universally understood and function according to conversational requirements within many language and cultural contexts (Cutting, 2008).

Tied to the topic of implicature is the notion of conversational politeness. Leech's politeness maxims illustrate the compulsory role that politeness plays in discourse. He attached his Politeness Principle to Grice's Co-operative Principle to clarify the connection between politeness and co-operation between speakers during discourse (Shahrokhi & Shirani Bidabadi, 2013; Spencer-Oatey & Jiang, 2003). Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest a different, broader set of politeness maxims that include politeness norms across cultures and the notion of face, as in positive and negative face and face saving strategies. Politeness maxims in conjunction with conversational implicature and the co-operative principles help to conceptualize discourse in terms of implied meaning and as a function of human behavior beyond just uttered words.

Presupposition

Presupposition comprises underlying assumptions that are taken for granted. These truths do not have to be upheld as hard or concrete facts; they can depend on word meaning or semantics as well as personal beliefs shared by both the speaker and hearer at the beginning of a conversation. The presupposed knowledge or truths act as background conditions during discourse (Bergmann, Currie Hall & Ross, 2007; Huang, 2014). An example of presupposition is the statement, *The president of the US is hard-working*. The presupposition *trigger* in this statement is the fact that the US has a president, which is common knowledge. Although the rest of the sentence cannot be assumed to be common knowledge or truthful, it might be presupposed to be true by both the speaker and the

hearer depending on their beliefs, background, or experiences. Presupposition operates at a subconscious level during discourse and emerges as common knowledge or basic truths that both the speaker and hearer agree upon without the requirement of having to overtly discuss them.

Deixis

Deixis examines language use in relation to the time, place, and speaker of an utterance. Deictic expressions point to the thing that they are referring to (almost literally in some cases as in when we point at a thing and say, *That over there!*), although they do not inherently refer to anything specific (Bergmann et al., 2007; Cutting, 2008; Huang, 2014). Spatial deictic expressions use words such as *here* and *there*. Temporal deictic expressions, or time deixis, consist of words such as *now*, *then*, and *later*. Personal deixis uses pronouns such as *we*, *you*, and *they*. Deictic expressions are context dependent because without contextual knowledge the expressions would have limited meaning. *She is there now* is an example of a deictic expression that would be confusing without appropriate context. Although not expressed in the same way, deixis is universal across languages because all languages include reference to time, space, and person (Huang, 2014).

Reference

Reference in pragmatics corresponds to how individual words or phrases refer to entities, such as people, objects, or ideas, within a conversation or text (Cutting, 2008; Huang, 2014). Everything that can be spoken of or communicated about has a potential referential expression. Referential expressions include everything from proper names and common nouns to descriptive noun phrases, as well as verbs to describe actions

(Huang, 2014). Referencing is semantic as it entails the use of words or phrases that describe things and provide meaning. It is also pragmatic because when referring to people, objects, or ideas, contextual factors influence meaning and shape discourse. Referents can be either exophoric or endophoric. Exophoric referents are expressions that have not been previously referred to in the discourse event while endophoric referents refer back to entities that were previously mentioned. A simple example of exophoric/endophoric referencing is, *The man petted the dog. It bit him.* In the latter sentence the endophoric pronouns *it* and *him* refer to *the dog* and *the man* in the former sentence, which uses exophoric referents. Referencing not only creates meaning in discourse through mutually understood words and phrases, it also causes discourse to be more efficient and cohesive through the use of substitutes like pronouns (Cutting, 2008). Referencing is a pragmatic concern because referents used in discourse rely not only on semantic meaning but also on related context.

Speech Acts

Speech acts are an integral part of the exploration of pragmatics. Speech acts can be defined as utterances or a string of utterances (the uttering of a string of morphemes, words, or sentences) that consist of a propositional meaning or locutionary act, an illocutionary force, and a perlocutionary force. The propositional meaning of a speech act is its linguistical or literal meaning. The illocutionary force is the speaker's implied meaning of the utterance—the speaker's meaning as it relates to their state of mind and the context. The perlocutionary force of a speech act is the end result or effect on the hearer in response to the speaker (Holtgraves, 2007; Huang, 2014; Intachakra, 2004; Searle, 1976). For example, the propositional meaning of the statement "I'm cold"

indicates that the person making the statement is in the state of feeling cold. The illocutionary force of this utterance could imply that the speaker wants the window closed or the heat turned up. The perlocutionary force might result in the hearer closing the window or turning up the heat.

Unsurprisingly, there are many different types of speech acts and generalizations about their nature, usage, and effect are long debated. According to Searle (1976), speech acts can be categorized according to their illocutionary force or the intended meaning that the speaker tries to convey. Searle created five categories of speech acts which are briefly explained below.

Representatives. The first category is any act of speech that commits the speaker to stating the truth or a fact and is referred to as a Representative. For instance, a statement such as *The sky is blue* acts as a true-false statement and represents a truth as viewed by the speaker. Utterances that assert, suggest, conclude, or describe something are examples of Representatives.

Directives. The second category in Searle's taxonomy is Directives, which are speech acts that get the hearer to do something. With a directive, the speaker is attempting to get the world to fit their words. Commanding, advising, and challenging are some examples of Directives.

Commissives. Commissives are the third category of speech acts and they are defined as speaker utterances that commit to a future action such as making a promise to the hearer. Pledging, vowing, threatening, or making an offer are also considered Commissives.

Declarations. The fourth category of speech acts is Declarations. A declaration is an utterance that changes or alters the condition of something. Often declarations are associated with authority or institutions. Operative statements such as *You're guilty!* and *I proclaim you husband and wife* are declarative speech acts. Hiring, firing, or resigning from a job, marrying, naming a newborn baby, or christening a boat are all instances of declarations.

Expressives. The fifth category of speech acts according to Searle is Expressives. Expressive speech acts are utterances that express a psychological state of being. The psycho-emotional state of the speaker is what drives the expressive utterance. The need to make amends, express regret, apologize for a mistake, show gratitude, greet or welcome someone, or congratulate a hearer on a job well done are examples of conditions that prompt expressive speech acts.

The expressive speech act of apologizing is one focus of the pragmatics lessons for this project and will be explained in more detail further on in this review. At this time it is important to discuss what it means when a speech act is not direct and its intended meaning is ambiguous.

Indirect Speech Acts

In almost all languages there are three basic sentence types: declaratives, interrogatives, and imperatives. A declarative sentence structure is generally associated with the intended meaning (illocutionary force) of asserting or stating something. An interrogative is associated with questioning or searching for a fact. An imperative has the force of ordering or requesting. When the sentence type matches the illocutionary force or intended meaning, then it is considered to be a direct speech act. When the sentence

type does not match the illocutionary force, it is considered to be an indirect speech act (Cutting, 2008; Huang, 2014; Searle, 1976). For example, the question *Did you clean up your room?* is a yes-no interrogative and in its most direct form would be considered a representative speech act that could be answered with a representative statement of fact, as in *Yes, in fact, I did clean up my room.* However, if a parent were to direct this question to their child, would the intended meaning or illocutionary force be a representative or a directive? Might this question actually be a directive to *clean up your room*? Does the parent already know the room is not cleaned up and is indirectly commanding the child to clean their room? What if the parent were to use the indirect, nonconventional, *Your room is such a mess!* On the surface this exclamatory statement may be acting as a representative speech act, but indirectly it may be acting as a directive to clean the room. For L2 learners, the use of indirect speech in the L2 is generally more difficult to comprehend and control because it necessitates analyzing context and understanding sociocultural norms along with linguistic rules. Understanding how to recognize a question in the L2 is simpler than understanding a question that is intended to be a directive or command. In order to understand indirect speech it is necessary to recognize contextual factors associated with the speech act and acclimate to the way that *conventionally* and *nonconventionally* indirect speech acts are used in the L2 (Aubrecht, 2013; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Yu, 1999;). Developing this kind of knowledge can be done by learning about the target language through its sociocultural context which entails studying the social rules and cultural norms associated with the language. The complex nature of indirect speech confirms the importance of explicitly teaching pragmatics and speech acts in the EFL classroom.

Context and Speech Acts

Pragmatics is the study of language in context and speech acts are a basic component of pragmatics, but what are the contextual factors that influence the intended meanings of speech acts and determine whether the use of a speech act is appropriate? Contextual factors range from the micro-social to the macro-social and are based on the individual, society, and culture associated with the language. According to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain,

> …the realization of speech acts in context may stem from at least three different types of variability: (a) intracultural, situational variability; (b) cross-cultural variability; (c) individual variability. Thus, there might be systematic differences in the realization patterns of speech acts, depending on social constraints embedded in the situation. For example, requests addressed to superiors might tend, in a given culture, to be phrased in less direct terms than requests addressed to social inferiors, or vice versa. On another dimension, within the same set of social constraints, members of one culture might tend to express a request more or less directly than members of another culture. Finally, individuals within the same society might differ in their speech act realization patterns, depending on personal variables such as sex, age, or level of education (1984, p. 197).

The main contextual factors, or variability, that affect the performance of a speech act are found to be universal and can influence speech act behavior in any language. Some of these factors are 1) social status—the relative status of the both the speaker and the hearer; 2) social distance—the speaker and hearer's familiarity to each other; 3) gender; 4) age; 5) the intensity or seriousness of the situation; 6) the purpose of the speech event;

7) the amount of time allowed for the interaction; and 8) the setting or location where the speech event takes place (Hinkel, 2006, 2014; Ishihara, 2006; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). Teaching the appropriate use of speech acts in the L2 requires knowledge about the sociocultural contextual factors related to the target language. For this project, it will be crucial to incorporate explicit instruction regarding context and speech act performance in English. Moreover, classroom discussion comparing and contrasting the most salient sociocultural factors in connection with offering apologies in the L1 and L2 will be part of the teaching pedagogy of this project.

Apologizing as an Expressive Speech Act

In English-speaking countries, it is customary to say *Excuse me, Pardon me*, or *I'm sorry* when bumping into another person in a public place; however, in some societies around the world this type of spoken gesture may not always be required. If an EL in an English-speaking domain neglects to apologize when it is customary to do so, they might be viewed as rude by native English speakers. This scenario is an example of how neglecting to perform a speech act—not apologizing—in an L2 environment can impact the learner's experience in that culture. For learners, understanding when and how to make an apology is important when using the target language.

There are many reasons that a speaker may want to utter an apology to a hearer. Through the study of pragmatics and discourse analysis, it is possible to develop a better understanding about what prompts a speaker of any language to apologize for something and how speakers express those apologies through linguistic routines or strategies. Many studies have been done on the act of apologizing. According to the Pragmatics and Speech Acts Bibliography on The Center for Advanced Research on Language

Acquisition website (CARLA, 2018), the number of research articles recorded for apologies is higher than for most other speech acts. Apologies are also found to be one of the most commonly used acts of speech in everyday life (Cheng, 2017; Intachakra, 2004). For this review, what defines an apology and how apologies are routinely performed in English and other languages will be considered.

An apology is a speech act or discourse event used to remediate or rectify a situation where the speaker has committed some sort of wrong to the hearer. An apology is usually a post-event act, meaning it occurs after the violation of a social norm has taken place (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984). An apology can be used to state that the speaker is sorry, explain what happened, make a repair for the offense, and/or make a promise of non-recurrence. An apology has the social function of helping the speaker stay on good terms with the hearer and maintain harmony in the relationship. Apologizing is a sort of peace offering that sends the message that the speaker is sorry for the wrongdoing, can account for the mistake, and will not do it again (Cheng, 2017; Intachakra, 2004; Kondo, 2010; Martinez-Flor, 2016; Martinez-Flor & Beltran-Palanques, 2014; Wyatt, 2014).

Apologies are also connected to concepts of politeness and are viewed according to politeness theories as face-saving devices. Offering an apology is a positive and negative face-saving strategy because an apology is a face-threatening act (FTA) for both the speaker and hearer. Positive face is the desire to be part of a group whereas negative face is the desire to be independent and/or not be imposed upon. Making a sociocultural faux pas can cause loss of positive face for the speaker, thereby prompting an apology in order to save face. An appropriate apology remediates the loss of positive face and brings the speaker/apologizer back into good graces. For the hearer/receiver of an apology, the

apology situation can be a FTA causing loss of negative face because the mistake made by the speaker causes an imposition to the hearer. Through the act of apologizing, the hearer regains negative face and, ideally, no longer feels imposed upon or inconvenienced by the speaker (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Cheng, 2017; Intachakra, 2004; Kondo, 2010; Martinez-Flor & Beltran-Palanques, 2014).

According to Cohen, Olshtain & Rosenstein (1986) the semantic formulae or strategies for offering an apology are predictable and common across languages and cultures. An apology routine follows a certain pattern and depending on contextual factors can be shorter or longer in length. The speech act set for apologies follows five possible routines.

1. An expression of an apology—when the speaker/apologizer says something like *I'm sorry, so sorry, I apologize, excuse me, or forgive me*. This routine includes an Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) such as the words sorry, apologize, excuse, forgive, or pardon.
2. Acknowledgement of responsibility—when the speaker/apologizer recognizes that they have made a mistake and acknowledges that it is their fault. This can be phrased in different ways, but the basic meaning is *I caused that thing to happen—it was my fault.*
3. An explanation or account—when the speaker/apologizer gives an explanation as to why or how the mistake was committed and is used as an indirect way of apologizing for the act. An example might be *I didn't see you there* (after bumping into someone) or *My car wouldn't start* (after arriving late to an event).

4. An offer of repair—when the speaker/apologizer offers to carry out some sort of action to repair the situation or compensate for damages. This routine or strategy is usually only used when there is actual damage. An example of this routine might be, *How can I make it up to you?*
5. A promise of non-recurrence—when the speaker/apologizer commits to not letting the mistake happen again. For example, if a coworker were to pick up a colleague late and cause them both to be late for work, then the apologizer might say, *Tomorrow I'll be on time, I promise*! This type of routine is not as frequently used as the other routines and is more situation specific (Cohen, et al., 1986; Intachakra, 2004; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Kondo, 2010; Valipour & Jadidi, 2015; Wyatt, 2014;).

Not every routine is used in all apology situations. Depending on the contextual factors involved, maybe, only one short routine is used or in more damaging situations a combination of routines might be called for (Cohen, et al., 1986; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

In English and other languages, there are additional strategies for apologizing which are used as a means of intensifying the apology sequence. These intensifiers include such features as expressing self-deficiency as in *I'm so forgetful*; explicitly blaming the self as in *I'm such a dummy!*; the use of adverbials such as *really* and *very* as in *I'm really sorry* and *I'm very sorry*; repeating multiple intensifiers such as *I'm so very, very sorry*; expressing explicit concern for the listener as in *Are you okay?*; and using multiple intensifying strategies such as *I'm so sorry! Are you alright? I'm really sorry*. Finally, one other possible strategy is that in the face of an apology, the apologizer denies any

fault or wrongdoing, thereby, possibly rejecting the need for an apology (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Cohen, et al, 1986; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

As can be seen, there is much to be considered when examining the appropriate way to apologize in a language. The fact that there are many possible routines to choose from when making apologies, validates the need for teaching this speech act in an explicit way in the EFL classroom. Understanding apology routines and relating them to possible contextual variables is required in order to make appropriate language choices during the act of making an apology in the L2. In the next section we will consider what it means to acquire the knowledge needed to make appropriate language choices in the target language and specifically the pragmatic interlanguage of the L2 learner.

Interlanguage

In order to better understand language learners and improve teaching pedagogy, such as the pedagogy for teaching and learning pragmatics, it is necessary to understand important theories regarding the mechanisms at work as learners acquire their L2. One mechanism is the interlanguage of the L2 learner, which can be described as the learner's internalized knowledge of the target language. The interlanguage is the internal linguistic system that underlies the learner's knowledge of the L2. This linguistic system is viewed as a system within its own right. It is believed to operate separately from the L1 and is compartmentalized as a discrete language within the cognitive framework of the individual L2 learner (Bardovi-Harlig, 2014; Tarone, 2014). The interlanguage reflects the accumulated knowledge that the learner has acquired about the L2 and it approximates the language norms of the target language as they are understood by native speakers. Generally speaking, as an L2 learner progresses in language proficiency and

competence in the TL, the interlanguage of the learner resembles more and more the native speaker norms of the TL. Establishing how interlanguage develops in L2 learners is crucial for creating teaching methodologies that are synchronous to developmental needs. This includes the pragmatic interlanguage of the learner.

Interlanguage Pragmatics

Interlanguage pragmatics is the study of how pragmatic knowledge is expressed in the interlanguage of L2 learners. It is focused on the L2 learners' understanding and use of the L2 in relation to L2 sociocultural norms. It further considers how the development of the L2 learner's interlanguage at the pragmatic level changes, either converging or diverging from native speaker norms (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999, 2014). The study of interlanguage pragmatics aims to discover "how interlanguage development interacts with and underpins L2 pragmatic development" (Bardovi-Harlig, 2014, pp. 135-136). Studies in interlanguage pragmatics include evaluating the pragmatic norms associated with language use and observing these norms as they are expressed by L1 and L2 users of language. For example, Hinkel (1996) found that proficient non-native speakers (NNS) of English could recognize pragmatically appropriate norms in English as well as NS; however, they were not as able or willing to apply those norms in real life contexts. This suggests that the pragmatic interlanguage of the NNS reached a NS level of understanding, but did not always transfer into pragmatic ability. Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei (1998) found that EFL students and teachers in Italy and Hungary recognized grammatical errors in English as much or more than NS of English, and they recognized them more frequently than pragmatic errors. They also viewed the grammatical errors as more serious than the pragmatic errors compared to NS. This study suggests that even

proficient L2 learners may not recognize the significance of pragmatically inappropriate behaviors in the L2. These inquiries identify how the pragmatic interlanguage of the L2 learner does not always match NS expectations and indicates how this could be problematic when communicating in the L2. For this reason, explicitly teaching pragmatics would be beneficial to all learners.

Interlanguage development comprises both linguistic development and pragmatic understanding. When these two aspects of interlanguage develop in relation to each other, this creates communicative competence, including pragmatic competence, which is what will be discussed in this next section.

Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic competence lies in how closely the pragmatic interlanguage of the L2 learner approximates target language norms. Pragmatic competence in a second language can be defined as the convergence of the L2 learner's pragmatic knowledge and skills with the accepted sociocultural norms associated with the target language. Developing pragmatic competence in the L2 involves acquiring both linguistic knowledge as well as cultural understanding. According to Hinkel (2014), "In language learning and usage, pragmatic and cultural competence are closely related (p. 399)." The pragmatic competence of the L2 learner is demonstrated in how well they are able to freely act or respond in a linguistically appropriate way in a wide variety of language-related situations in the L2 environment (Chang, 2011; Ishihara, 2006, 2010; Yu, 1999). Learning, comprehending, and demonstrating the appropriate routines and behaviors for a variety of speech acts leads to advancement in pragmatic competence. Developing pragmatic competence in EFL learners is central to this capstone project. In order to

create a pedagogical system to improve pragmatic competence, it is important to recognize its two components. Pragmatic competence can be divided into two parts: pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence.

Pragmalinguistic Competence. Pragmalinguistic competence is the ability to use linguistic resources to act or respond in a linguistically appropriate way during a speech act (Chang, 2011; Ishihara, 2006; Taguchi, 2018; Yan & Zhuang, 2010). When an L2 learner is able to access a variety of linguistic expressions and use them appropriately, pragmalinguistic competence is shown. In contrast, understanding a discourse situation and sensing the appropriate way to respond, but not having access to a sufficient number of linguistic expressions could create pragmatic failure at the pragmalinguistic level. In this regard, linguistic development assists with pragmatic competence.

Sociopragmatic Competence. Sociopragmatic competence is the verbal and non-verbal communicative behavior surrounding a speech act. Competence at this level is represented by a reasonable understanding of the prevailing cultural norms associated with the L2. It also includes understanding contextual factors such as age, gender, social status, social role, and distance in relation to L2 social norms (Chang, 2011; Ishihara, 2006; Taguchi, 2018; Yan & Zhuang, 2010). One example of sociopragmatic competence involves the use of backchanneling, which requires that hearers provide speakers with feedback indicating that they are listening. In English, it might mean repeating words or phrases such as *yeah* or *uh huh*. The proper use of backchanneling indicates language competence at the sociopragmatic level (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

Developing pragmatic competence—both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic—requires the acquisition of linguistic skills along with social skills in the L2 environment.

The sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competence of the L2 learner is generally measured by way of real life conversations in authentic contexts and the relative number of successful interactions made by the L2 learner. Studies in pragmatic competence suggest that the development of pragmalinguistic skills and sociopragmatic skills are interrelated and will develop correspondingly as long as there is sufficient input/intake regarding linguistic forms and sociocultural norms (Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei, 1998; Chang, 2010, 2011; Hinkel, 1996; Kasper, 2001; Padilla Cruz, 2013). In the EFL teaching and learning environment there is a tendency to focus on grammatical and lexical learning over sociocultural norms. This tendency creates a greater need for instruction in sociopragmatic skills in order to improve overall pragmatic competence (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Ishihara, 2006, 2010; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Vallenga, 2008). The scarcity of instruction regarding pragmatics in EFL settings and the necessity to learn pragmatic norms in conjunction with linguistic forms further validates the reasoning for creating a teaching curriculum focused on pragmatics and speech acts. This type of curriculum is best described as instructional pragmatics.

Instructional Pragmatics

Interlanguage development, pragmatic and sociocultural norms, and pragmatic competence are examined together out of a need to understand more completely the factors that contribute to pragmatic failure on the part of L2 learners. The desire to realize how pragmatic failure can be overcome, and assist L2 learners with improving their overall language competence, has led to the creation of a pedagogy for teaching and learning pragmatics. This pedagogy is referred to as instructional pragmatics (Ishihara, 2006, 2010; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Vellenga, 2008).

Even L2 learners with a high level of grammatical ability can experience pragmatically faulty interactions or misunderstandings. The fact that many pragmatic norms positively transfer from L1 to L2 does not guarantee that L2 learners will achieve sufficient pragmatic competence in the L2. In addition, L2 learners who are immersed in the L2 environment may not always acquire pragmatic abilities in line with native speakers (Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Taguchi, 2018). It is evident that the amount of input a learner is exposed to in the L2 positively impacts the acquisition of L2 norms. According to Schmidt's cognitive theory of noticing, attention, and awareness (the noticing hypothesis), the act of noticing a linguistic element in the L2 via input is the first step toward acquisition of that element (Alcon Soler, 2008; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). Although noticing does not automatically equate to acquisition, it does contribute to the process. Once a learner has noticed something about the L2, the next step is to pay attention to that element in a conscious way; eventually bringing one's attention to total awareness of the element, and then retaining or acquiring that element to be utilized and demonstrated toward increased competence (Bu, 2012; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Rose, 2005; Takahashi, 2010). The goal of instructional pragmatics is to assist this cognitive process of noticing, paying attention to, and bringing awareness to the pragmatic norms of the L2 in order to increase the learner's pragmatic knowledge and competency (Alcon Soler, 2008; Ishihara, 2010; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

Pragmatic competence is an important part of overall communicative competence; however, the most beneficial means for achieving high level pragmatic skills is not clearly established. A range of early studies demonstrated that grammatical awareness often preceded pragmatic awareness and the reason for this difference in development

was not always apparent (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999). However, additional research suggests that this difference in development is the result of two interacting components, (1) a lack of immersion or experience with the L2 culture or society and (2) instruction that focuses on linguistical forms over cultural competence (Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei, 1998; Kasper, 2001; Rose, 2005). Therefore, in order to develop pragmatic proficiency, the L2 learner would need (1) immersion and direct experience in the L2 culture and/or (2) direct instruction regarding sociocultural norms. Essentially, like other language skills, meaningful input for pragmatics should be in the form of experience in society and/or instruction in the classroom (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Bardovi-Harlig & Dornyei, 1998; Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Hinkel, 2014; Ishihara, 2006; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Rose, 2005). Having both cultural immersion and direct instruction would be ideal; however, having both is not possible for all language learners, especially EFL learners since they are studying a foreign language in their non-English-speaking home environment. This dilemma makes evident why direct instruction in pragmatics is crucial in the EFL environment—without it, an important linguistic component is, in effect, absent from view for EFL learners.

Exposure versus Instruction

Although it is possible for an L2 learner to develop pragmatic competence over an extended period of time through regular exposure and interaction in the L2 environment, the realization of that learning appears to be somewhat unpredictable. A fundamental question in the field of interlanguage pragmatics is whether L2 pragmatic norms are best learned via real life exposure or through instruction (Rose, 2005; Taguchi, 2018). The answer to this question appears to be that instruction for learning pragmatic norms is very

useful to all L2 learners whether they are learning the L2 as a second language (ESL) or a foreign language (EFL). In the ESL environment, formal instruction in pragmatics can enhance real life exposure for the ESL learner and improve pragmatic competence in everyday interactions (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Halenko & Jones, 2011). In the EFL environment, formal instruction in pragmatics elucidates L2 pragmatic norms and heightens awareness for the EFL learner which leads to a more thorough understanding of the target language (Bu, 2012; Chang, 2010, 2011; Martinez-Flor, 2016; Rose, 2000, 2005, 2009).

If instruction assists in the development of pragmatic understanding and ability in both the ESL and EFL environments, the question remains regarding the best type of instruction. The two styles of instruction in pragmatics most often researched in terms of effectiveness are implicit and explicit instruction (Taguchi, 2015).

Implicit and Explicit Instruction

Instruction in pragmatics that is implicit does not require overt discussion about the rules and norms associated with pragmatically appropriate behavior (Glaser, 2013; Ishihara, 2010). Implicit instruction is created by providing classroom materials with guidance that allow learners to draw their own conclusions about pragmatic elements. This form of pragmatics instruction is in contrast to explicit instruction which requires explaining or metacommunicating about pragmatics and sociocultural norms and is referred to as metapragmatic communication (Taguchi, 2015). Explicit instruction in pragmatics entails directly explaining the pragmatic elements found in the educational materials related to the target language (Bu, 2012; Ishihara, 2010; Rose, 2005; Taguchi, 2015). Studies suggest that in both ESL and EFL environments implicit and explicit

instruction in pragmatics have a constructive effect on the development of pragmatic competence (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Taguchi, 2015). However, much of the research suggests that explicit instruction has a more significant, longer-lasting effect than implicit instruction (Taguchi, 2015).

In a study done in the UK by Halenko and Jones (2011), the experimental group of Chinese ESL students who were given six hours of explicit instruction on the use of request strategies showed considerable improvement in their pragmatic understanding on a post-test compared to the Chinese ESL students who received no instruction. This study demonstrates that even though both groups of learners were exposed to the English language environment on a daily basis, instruction can make a difference and accelerate the use of more pragmatically accurate language. Despite the immediate outcome, it should be noted that later in the study the experimental group showed very little improvement on the delayed test given several weeks after instruction. However, based on a comparison of other similar studies, the researchers surmised that this was mainly an indication that explicit instruction must be sustained over the long term in order to create long-term understanding. Ultimately, the results of this study signify that on-going explicit instruction in pragmatics is beneficial to learners and suggests that exposure along with instruction can increase comprehension and ability.

In a study done in China with Chinese EFL learners (Bu, 2012), three groups were used to determine the effects of both implicit and explicit instruction on the development of pragmatic competence. The first group of learners received explicit instructions which consisted of reviewing NS-NS role play samples and then given detailed metapragmatic information on the pragmatic norms of making suggestions in English; the second group

of learners was given implicit instructions on making suggestions which consisted of having them notice any differences between the NS-NS role play samples and their own role play inventions; the third group was given no instructions—they were only allowed to review the NS-NS role play samples and then answer a short set of comprehension questions. Each group was given a pre- and post-test for the treatment period.

The study showed that students who received explicit instruction surpassed those who received implicit instruction or no instruction. The learners in the first group who were given explicit metapragmatic information demonstrated the most improvement overall on the post-test. The learners given implicit instruction also showed noticeable improvement even though the improvement was not as high as the explicit instruction group. The control group of students who received no instruction in this study showed very little improvement in pragmatic understanding from the pre-test to the post-test. Overall, this study suggests that direct instruction is beneficial to L2 learners' level of pragmatic competence and explicit instruction provides more focused learning and better results.

These studies suggest that instruction in pragmatics is advantageous for learners in both the ESL and EFL environment, especially explicit instruction with metapragmatic content (Bu, 2012; Halenko & Jones, 2011; Taguchi, 2015). Although it is helpful to know that instruction in pragmatics is both valuable and necessary, it is not as easy to know how it can be implemented in the typical classroom setting. Teaching and learning environments may vary in their acceptance and incorporation of instructional pragmatics. The typical language program or classroom environment may not easily accommodate a new component like pragmatics instruction; however, the research indicates that adding

this component might be beneficial. In the next section I will describe common elements in the EFL teaching and learning environment as well as some common traits of EFL learners. I will also discuss the means for incorporating instructional pragmatics into an EFL curriculum, and establish how that can lead to improved outcomes for communicative competence for EFL learners in the EFL classroom.

The EFL Environment and Learner

At the start of the 21st century an estimated 1.5 billion people were users of English and about 75 percent of them used English as a second language. It is predicted that by the year 2020 as many as 2 billion people will be using English as a first or second language with the vast majority of them being second language users (Pakir, 1999; The British Council, 2013). In a large number of discourse situations, English speakers are using English as a lingua franca (ELF) in non-English speaking contexts (Celce-Murcia, 2014; Illes & Akcan, 2017). In all probability, many of these L2 English users first studied English as a foreign language in their home country. The characteristics of learning a foreign language in a learner's country of origin are dissimilar from learning a second language within the L2 native speaking society (Gilmore, 2007; Illes & Akcan, 2017; Taguchi, 2008, 2018). This discussion focuses on learners of English who are studying in their home countries, and examines a typical English language teaching and learning environment in these non-English speaking countries.

Studying English as a foreign language entails learning English primarily in a classroom setting that is not encompassed by an English language society. Often the English teacher in the EFL setting is a NNS of English and the language program is part of a larger non-English speaking educational context such as a middle school, high

school, college, or private language school (Moussu & Llurda, 2008; Rao & Yuan, 2016; Urgilés & Villacreces, 2017). Students in an EFL setting may have the same first language and culture. They are usually studying English as part of a larger curriculum, not necessarily as the core curriculum, unless they are English majors at the college or university level (Eyring, 2014; Kim, 2016; Lai, 2013; Rao & Yuan, 2016). Today, for the majority of young EFL learners, studying English is compulsory. Many nations around the world require young students to begin studying English as early as third grade and continue studying until matriculation from secondary school and into college or university (Asassfeh, Khwaileh, Al-Shaboul, & Alshboul, 2012; Eurostat, 2017; Lai, 2013; Rao & Yuan, 2016). In addition, they are often required to take high-stakes standardized tests to evaluate their English skills (Eyring, 2014; Kim, 2014). Many adult learners tend to be users of English for work purposes and their goal is to improve their conversation skills at the job (Eyring, 2014; Taguchi, 2018). If the learner is an EFL teacher in their home country, they may need to attend continuing education classes in English as part of their teaching requirements (Moussu & Llurda, 2008). English learners in their home countries have a variety of reasons for studying and improving their English language skills. Many of those reasons are practical or instrumental to improving their lives in terms of educational goals and career advancement (Chen, 2017; Eyring, 2014).

Although many students of English travel abroad to English-speaking countries in order to improve their language skills (Taguchi, 2018; The British Council, 2013), there are many who are unable to do that. Those who cannot afford to travel abroad must continue their study of English within their home country where there may be a lack of

real life exposure to English. Still, traveling abroad, despite a great deal of exposure to the target culture and language, is not necessarily a guarantee of language improvement, including pragmatic competence. Studies involving English learners in the study-abroad context show that it is not whether a learner has been living in an English-speaking environment that determines their level of pragmatic competence or how long they have lived in that environment. It is the amount of time learners spend interacting with others and using English consistently that is a greater determiner of pragmatic improvement (Taguchi, 2008, 2018). Language can be learned as long as there is interaction between interlocutors. The amount of language acquired by the L2 learner depends not only on the learning context, but the quantity and quality of language-related interactions. According to Taguchi (2018), interactional competence is viewed as a "socially co-constructed phenomenon" (p. 126). The key to pragmatic competence is the level of interaction that ELs engage in whether it is in the ESL or EFL environment. For students who are unable to travel abroad and experience English-speaking domains first hand, it is encouraging to know that they can still accomplish pragmatic competence within their home culture setting by way of classroom instruction.

Because EFL students often do not have much opportunity to learn or practice English outside of the classroom, classroom interactions, course materials, and homework assignments must be relevant, engaging, and authentic (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Gilmore, 2007; Krulatz, 2014). As Taguchi states:

> Hence, it seems that learners in a FL environment are not necessarily disadvantaged in pragmatic development; pragmatic comprehension develops naturally in domestic, formal classroom settings that afford limited opportunity

> for input, communicative practice, and pragmatic awareness, as long as the context affords sufficient resources for such development (2008, p. 443).

Although EFL learners lack much opportunity to interact with NS of English, it does not mean that they cannot achieve both pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence in line with ESL learners and native speakers (Taguchi, 2008). By identifying speech acts and reviewing speech act strategies and routines that are typical within the target language community, and with the aid of materials (e.g. videos, video transcriptions, and texts) that are realistic and compelling, the EFL classroom can become a pragmatically rich environment (Hinkel, 2014; Taguchi, 2008). Through the learner's personal observations and journaling, and using cross-cultural analysis of home culture and target culture norms, learners will be able to identify speech act norms that are common in their L1 and compare and contrast them to L2 norms. Once students are acquainted with speech act norms and can identify and discuss them, they can use the classroom environment to codify their own use of speech acts and navigate the most appropriate ways to perform speech acts in the L2 with classmates and teachers (ChavarrIa & Bonany, 2006; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Lazaraton, 2014). Finally, creating interactions through the use of teacher-assisted discussion, group discussion, role-plays, and pair work that involves task-based activities, pragmatic development will begin to occur organically in the classroom (ChavarrIa & Bonany, 2006; Duff, 2014; Illes & Akcan, 2017; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). By creating a pragmatically rich classroom experience, learners can become competent users of English at the pragmatic level. This knowledge and skill will better prepare them when opportunities arise where they might need to

speak with other ELF users outside of the classroom (e.g. on the job, when traveling, on social media).

Directly teaching pragmatics in the classroom, whether ESL or EFL, is an emerging movement that developed as a result of research in interlanguage pragmatics (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). Creating a curriculum that is focused on integrating instructional pragmatics with other teaching modalities is viewed as a valuable development toward improving L2 instruction. By making pragmatic competence a necessary teaching and learning goal aimed at refining overall communicative competence, language programs can improve teaching practices and learning outcomes in language learning environments. It is the intent of this curriculum development project to utilize instructional pragmatics to improve EFL programs and build communicative competence for students in the EFL teaching and learning environment. The benefits of an EFL instructional pragmatics curriculum will create advantages for EFL learners inside and outside the classroom.

Project Rationale

The intent of this capstone project is the advancement of instructional pragmatics as a component of interlanguage pragmatic development. More specifically, the focus is on operationalizing instructional pragmatics in an EFL teaching and learning environment in order to enhance the pragmatic competence of adult ELs when performing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English.

The reason for this capstone project is to develop a curriculum that will target pragmatic competence as a teaching and learning goal in EFL classrooms. Acquiring pragmatic skills in conjunction with linguistic forms is a necessary part of learning to be

a competent and fluent user of English, or any language. Creating an EFL curriculum with lessons that focus on pragmatics related concepts, such as context and contextual factors, politeness theories, understanding speech acts, and performing speech act routines in culturally appropriate ways, will lead to more comprehensive and enlightening teaching and learning experiences for both teachers and students and will contribute to EL communicative competence overall.

Summary

In this chapter I reviewed the areas of pragmatics research that lay the foundation for creating a curriculum based on teaching and learning pragmatics. I have defined and explored basic theoretical components within the study of pragmatics, which are Implicature, the Co-operative Principles and Politeness Maxims; Presupposition; Deixis; Referencing; and most importantly for this project, Speech Act Theory. I have outlined the basic elements of Speech Act Theory and explained the significance of indirect speech as well as contextual factors related to speech acts. I also explained the research on the expressive speech act of apologizing and the routines or formulae that comprise the use of apologies in English. In addition, the topics of interlanguage and interlanguage pragmatics were discussed in relation to the process of language acquisition and developing pragmatic competence. The notion of pragmatic competence was broken down and explained in terms of its two complimenting parts, which are pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence. As a component of interlanguage pragmatics, I discussed the fairly new field of exploration called instructional pragmatics. I explained how explicit instruction regarding speech act formulae can be used to improve the learning experiences for L2 learners because of the emphasis on pragmatic

comprehension in conjunction with linguistic development. Finally, I described the standard EFL teaching and learning environment as well as the general situation for many EFL learners including their typical needs and motivations. I also explained how lessons that are rich in materials and resources that provide explicit instruction in pragmatics can be just as beneficial to L2 learners as experiencing the target language in its native domain. This literature review illustrated how research in pragmatics defines instruction in pragmatics and drives the curriculum for this project.

In the next chapter I will give a detailed description of the curriculum development project including the main purpose and goal. I will explain the framework for the curriculum and lessons and describe the methodologies that will be used for instruction. I will describe the EFL setting for the lessons, and I will describe the audience for this project which are intermediate to advanced level adult EFL learners. I will also give an appraisal regarding the timeline for the curriculum with a breakdown of the individual lessons in terms of calendar semester and class times. The next chapter will basically detail the project and a rationale for each step of the project.

CHAPTER THREE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Introduction

The intent of this capstone project is the advancement of instructional pragmatics as a component of interlanguage pragmatic development. More specifically, the focus is on operationalizing instructional pragmatics in an EFL teaching and learning environment in order to enhance the pragmatic competence of adult ELs when performing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English. The following question best iterates this undertaking: What might an instructional pragmatics curriculum for adult EFL learners look like? This curriculum development project is designed as a speaking skills course focused on improving interlanguage pragmatic competence when producing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English.

In this chapter I describe the curriculum development project in more detail. I give an overview of the project and explain the basic pedagogical framework that is used to devise the project. I clarify the goal of the project and provide a referenced rationale for choosing this goal. I describe the research supporting the teaching pedagogy supporting the curriculum units. In addition, I describe the intended EFL setting for the project, the classroom environment, and the possible societal influences outside the classroom. And I describe the intended audience for the project, which is adult EFL learners in non-English speaking environments such as their home country or any place where English is not the

native language. Finally, I present a description of the course design process and explain how the lessons are organized and timed.

Overview of the Project

This curriculum development project was designed as a speaking skills course consisting of several lessons for intermediate to advanced level ELs in an EFL environment using research-based instructional techniques focused on improving interlanguage pragmatic competence when producing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English. This curriculum project consists of two units consisting of ten 50-minute lessons. The first unit is made up of seven lessons with the goal of improving learners' understanding of concepts in pragmatics, including context and contextual factors, politeness principles, and speech acts. The second unit consists of three lessons focused on understanding and performing the speech act of apologizing in English in a culturally appropriate way.

The first lesson consists of an evaluation or pre-test in the form of a discourse completion task (DCT) to determine learners' familiarity with speech acts and how to respond in certain speech act situations. Subsequent lessons are scaffolded to increase learners' awareness of concepts in pragmatics, contextual factors that affect discourse, politeness principles, categories and types of speech acts, identifying speech acts in scripted dialogues from TV shows and movies, recognizing apologies, comparing and contrasting apology routines based on cultural differences, noticing apology routines in English, analyzing apology routines and related contextual factors, reflecting on pragmatic failures when making an apology in the L2, performing apologies in role plays, and reflecting on how to improve speaking performance when making an apology in

English. In addition, an assessment was designed in the form of a role play to discover whether learners develop both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic competence for making apologies in English. Finally, a post-test DCT was created to help discover learner development in pragmatic competence as a result of the lessons. Overall, the aim of this project was to create a curriculum with lessons that raise learners' awareness of pragmatics and speech acts and motivate them to want to learn more about speech act routines and language use in context. Raising learners' awareness assists them in making more pragmatically appropriate language choices both inside and outside the classroom (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003).

Project Framework

The main goal of this project was to increase EFL learner understanding of concepts involving pragmatics, especially the appropriate use of speech acts and speech act routines for making apologies in English. Targeting pragmatic competence as a teaching and learning goal has been overlooked in most EFL curriculums (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Gilmore, 2007; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Urgilés & Villacreces, 2017). Acquiring pragmatic skills in conjunction with linguistic forms is a necessary part of learning to be a competent and fluent user of English. By creating an EFL curriculum that focused on pragmatic development, teaching and learning experiences are improved and this contributes to EL communicative competence overall (Alcon Soler, 2008; ChavarrIa & Bonany, 2006; Ifantidou & Tzanne, 2012). For current EFL programs, including a pragmatics curriculum is beneficial as it emphasizes language use in context and broadens the learners' knowledge regarding English as the target language. This broader understanding will benefit learners when they use English either in an English-

speaking environment or as a lingua franca (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Krulatz, 2014; Neff & Rucynski Jr, 2013; Urgilés & Villacreces, 2017).

In order to build a curriculum for teaching and learning pragmatics, it was important to focus on teaching practices that encouraged both linguistic awareness and pragmatic understanding. The framework used for achieving this goal involved several different teaching practices. The core methods in this project were the awareness-raising approach, explicit instruction, cross-cultural analysis, journaling and reflection, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and performance and task-based activities. Evaluation and assessment instruments were also used as teaching and learning tools.

It is necessary to use more than one instructional practice when teaching a second language, including pragmatics instruction, as each method facilitates different cognitive functions and helps the learner acquire language concepts and linguistic forms in a way that is relative to their normal learning style (Alcon Soler, 2008; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Parrish, 2006, 2015; Taguchi, 2011). The teaching methods used to create and build the framework for this instructional pragmatics curriculum project are explained in the next section.

Teaching Methodologies

Awareness raising is activated in the lessons by the use of videos and video transcripts that consist of politeness behaviors and dialogue samples with speech act content. In the dialogue videos, with guidance from the teacher, learners view the videos and read the transcripts in order to notice the routines and word phrases that the speakers use during discourse. The learners also become aware of the context or situation related to the speech act and surmise the contextual factors that influence the speech act sequences

(ChavarrIa & Bonany, 2006; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Kondo, 2010; Martinez-Flor & Beltran-Palanques, 2014). There is also a video that does not have any dialogue, but demonstrates through actions different types of behaviors and politeness norms. Both types of videos are used for eliciting discussion about social rules and cultural norms which are an important part of pragmatic competence (Hinkel, 2014).

For each lesson, through the use of explicit and/or deductive instruction, the teacher illustrated the concepts of pragmatics, contextual factors, politeness principles, speech act categories and types of speech acts, apology routines or conventional apology phrases. One goal of the instruction was to accentuate the linguistic forms most commonly used to perform apology routines. The teacher explained the five universal routines for making apologies (see Chapter Two) and the conventional linguistic forms that are used in English to enact these routines. Once learners are familiar with these concepts through explicit instruction, they analyze examples of real or realistic apologies and deduce which routines fit the description offered by the teacher. Explicit instruction creates more noticing and awareness and leads students to understand speech act routines more thoroughly (Bardovi-Harlig & Vellenga, 2012; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Martinez-Flor & Beltran-Palanques, 2014).

For students in the EFL environment, comparing and contrasting elements of their L1 to English as their L2 might simply mean translating words and phrases from the L1 to the L2. It may not be as common to compare and contrast the sociocultural norms associated with each language. For learning pragmatics and speech acts, cross-cultural analysis is incorporated into the classroom lessons by having students compare the norms for apologizing in their home language to English speaking norms (Kondo, 2010;

Limberg, 2015). By finding the differences between how the two languages are used, learners learn through association and identification. They also realize their own subjective views about the nature of their L1 versus English so they can choose how to respond in English based on their subjective view and identity. This approach in the EFL classroom also encourages social relevancy and respect in regards to the students' home language and culture (Ishihara, 2006, 2010; LoCastro, 2013; Taguchi, 2011).

Through the use of observation and journaling, EFL learners act as sociocultural ethnographers and record observations about speech acts, particularly making apologies, in their L1 and English. They reflect on what they observe and draw relative conclusions about the nature of speech act routines. And through the process of journaling they improve their writing skills (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Krulatz, 2014).

In language teaching and learning, CLT has developed into an effective practice for increasing L2 fluency (Savignon, 1991; Savignon & Wang, 2003). The CLT approach is highly regarded, yet, in the traditional EFL setting it is not always accepted; however, it is gaining more acceptance today as both teachers and learners grow more accustomed to this more liberal teaching style (Asassfeh, Khwaileh, Al-Shaboul, & Alshboul, 2012; Savignon & Wang, 2003). The CLT curricula consists of five components: language arts, language for a purpose, personal language use, theatre arts, and beyond the classroom (Savignon, 1987). The idea is to use these different components to create lessons that promote communicative competence in the classroom and outside the classroom. A curriculum that targets pragmatic development in an EFL setting also requires the use of all five components. For example, language for a purpose means operationalizing functional language and language in context; personal language use entails student-

teacher and student-student discussions in the classroom; and language beyond the classroom consists of real world observations and interactions or field trips whenever possible. It is also advantageous to use language arts and theater arts during the lessons because by becoming familiar with literary works and theater, including storybooks, poems, plays, films and television shows in English, learners observe language use within meaningful contexts which will further their knowledge about English usage (Savignon, 1987, 1991). By using the CLT approach in the lessons on pragmatics, more teaching options were utilized to make the lessons more communicative and meaningful.

Performance and task-based activities go with the CLT approach to language teaching and learning. Activities such as role-plays, group discussions using prompts, mingle activities that use a question/answer format, games, and problem-solving tasks such as a transcribing and gap-fill activities are used to enhance instruction while encouraging classroom interaction and communication in English, which means more L2 input and output (Ellis, 2000, 2014).

Initial evaluation and final assessment are valuable teaching and learning tools in the EFL setting as long as they are authentic, valid and reliable. According to Ishihara & Cohen, there are four reasons for assessing pragmatics in the classroom.

1. Classroom assessment of pragmatics sends a message to the students that their ability to be pragmatically appropriate in the comprehension and production of language in different sociocultural situations is valued or even advantageous.
2. The very act of putting such items on a test gives the students an incentive to study L2 pragmatics.

3. Assessment gives teachers an opportunity to see the relative control their students have in what may at times be a high-stakes area for L2 performance (e.g., getting or holding a job).
4. It gives teachers an opportunity to check on whether learners have learned what they explicitly taught them (2010, p. 264).

In pragmatics, testing is accomplished through the use of DCTs, questionnaires, role plays or interviews. These types of assessments are commonly used in the research on interlanguage pragmatics and have been validated by a number of studies (Roever, 2011; Taguchi, 2018; Youn, 2015). Using models from the research is a helpful way to assess learners in an EFL classroom that is focused on developing pragmatic competence. These assessment techniques were applied throughout the lessons in this project.

The instructional methods described above were employed in this pragmatics curriculum with the intention of creating lessons that are insightful, interactive, and meaningful to students. Hopefully, by illustrating and demonstrating concepts in pragmatics and apology routines in English that are appropriate according to English language norms, students will garner the importance of pragmatics in language learning, and develop an appreciation for pragmatic competence as a factor of overall communicative competence. Ultimately, it is the intention of this project to provide pragmatics instruction that motivates and inspires students to become more proficient users of English as a result of deeper-level pragmatic understanding.

In the next section I will discuss the educational setting for this instructional pragmatics curriculum development project. The following discussion is a continuation of the description of the EFL environment mentioned in the literature review chapter.

The EFL Setting for Instruction in Pragmatics

Because I am not currently teaching in an EFL setting, I rely on my past experience as an EFL teacher in South Korea and China to describe the setting. Based on my experience, the EFL setting for this curriculum development project is best taught starting at the intermediate level with teenaged or adult students who are in high school or more advanced studies. For example, the setting could be a three year high school, a two year technical college, a four year university, or a supplementary language center for teen and adult learners. The lessons would be taught in a classroom that accommodates no more than 30 students. The classroom would have up-to-date audio-visual equipment and internet access capable of projecting videos on an overhead system. The room would have a blackboard or whiteboard to be used for writing out instructions, illustrating examples, showing diagrams, and so on. The blackboard/whiteboard could also be used by the students when giving demonstrations, presentations, or sharing answers to questions and prompts. Ideally, the classroom desks or tables would be arranged in groupings so as to promote the formation of pairs or small student groups in order to encourage interaction between students. The teacher's desk would be near the back of the classroom or off to the side with the student desks or tables situated toward the front of the room with easy access to the blackboard, AV equipment, or podium. The classroom for this setting would be conducive to presentation work and interaction among students and with the teacher.

The teaching and learning program that this curriculum supports could be any number of programs. For example, it could be an international high school with English as the main language, an EFL program within a college or university campus, a translation or

interpretation study program at a university, an English language training center geared toward working adults, or an EFL teacher professional development program. Whatever the actual English language program or physical setting, ideally, the units and lessons would be focused on pragmatics and speech acts and be part of a semester long speaking skills course. It is also possible for the course to be a content-based course that includes some lessons in pragmatics. Whether it is an entire semester long course in pragmatics or a content-based course with some lessons focused on pragmatics, the purpose would be to introduce a number of speech acts and illustrate standard speech act routines, while relating them to the contextual factors that influence speech acts and meaning. In the name of expedience, for this project the focus is on general pragmatic concepts and the speech act of apologizing, although the semester long course would involve teaching and learning many different speech acts.

An EFL setting for teaching and learning English comprises multiple scenarios and each one can function differently based on the region, country, city, or campus where the instructional pragmatics course is being taught. It is my experience that the possible setting I described above would be conducive to teaching and learning pragmatics and speech acts to EFL learners in a semester long course.

Along with the setting it is important to consider the audience for this curriculum. Next, I will describe the typical EFL student who may be interested in taking a course in pragmatics in order to learn speech acts and improve pragmatic understanding in English.

The EFL Learner as Audience for Instruction in Pragmatics

Over the course of six years of teaching English in South Korea and China, I was fortunate to experience teaching a variety of students in several different settings. My

first job was teaching young children between the ages of five and 16 in an after-school program in a small city on the east coast of South Korea. My lack of teaching experience left me unprepared for these lively and adorable youngsters; however, it was a great introduction into the world of EFL teaching and learning. Because of extenuating circumstances related to the management of the school, I moved from that position to a "visiting instructor" position at a relatively small, private university north of Seoul. The students were almost all first year college students who were majoring in a variety of subjects. The single course that I taught for 15-20 hours a week was basic English conversation for students of any major. It was a compulsory course for all students in their first year at the school. Most of the learners were low to intermediate level speakers of English, although many of them were "false beginners," meaning they could read in English better than they could speak, listen, or write. After teaching at the school for two years, I found that there were many false beginners in my classes. And, after teaching in China for three and half years, I noticed the same phenomenon happening with my students there. It seemed that students were fairly comfortable reading, or even listening, in English, but lacked experience with the productive skills of speaking and writing. Through readings and conversations with colleagues I learned that this phenomenon did not go unnoticed by language researchers and policy makers in both countries, and that was often the reason for bringing NSs of English into their English language programs. The intended goal for including NSs of English into the school setting was to assist students in gaining more first-hand experience with fluent speakers and begin regular usage of English. This background story illustrates a common scenario in teaching and learning English as a foreign language. Many students of English in non-English

speaking countries who are literate in their first language often have access to reading and listening materials in English, but do not have interactional experience. Consequently, they have a difficult time developing their productive skills. It is with these difficulties in mind that this curriculum development project is drawn up.

Based on my experience and observations, the students most likely to take a course in pragmatics and speech acts would be intermediate to advanced level speakers of English as a foreign language who are studying English in a traditional school setting such as a college or university. Another possibility would be an international high school program for local EFL students. This course might also be desired amongst working adults learning English in a supplemental language program with classes held in the evenings or on weekends. English teachers who are NNS of English might also find a course in pragmatics and speech acts useful as part of their ongoing teacher development plan.

The most probable group of students would be literate in their L1 and will have been studying English as a foreign language for more than a few years. These students would have a good grasp of linguistic concepts such as grammar (e.g. verbs, nouns, adjectives, etc.) and sentence structure (subject-verb-object), and an intermediate or higher level vocabulary range. Students at this level would be able to understand explicit instructions concerning pragmatics and speech act routines as well as contextual factors effecting discourse. They would also be able to discuss cross-cultural considerations when examining speech acts in their L1 and English. Students in this type of pragmatics course would be motivated to improve their productive skills in English, particularly their speaking skills. Hence, the selling point of the course for these students would be its emphasis on understanding language in context and speech act routines as a way of

improving speaking and interaction in English. For this curriculum development project, the ideal student would be an experienced learner of English who is motivated to further develop their speaking skills, and is open to discussing and examining language and its relationship to context and culture.

Now that the setting and typical EFL learner has been discussed, it is time to look at a brief description of the project design and the timeframe needed to teach this curriculum.

Project Description, Course Design, and Timeline for Units/Lessons

This curriculum project is comprised of two units within a larger semester long course (see Appendix B for sample of course syllabus). Each unit consists of a series of 50-minute lessons taught three times per week over the course of approximately three to four weeks (e.g. 9:00-9:50 am, Monday-Wednesday-Friday). The content of the first unit focuses on general concepts related to pragmatics such as the definition of pragmatics, contextual factors related to discourse situations, politeness principles, and categories and types of speech acts. The second unit is focuses on the speech act of apologizing and the routines and conventions associated with apologizing in English. Both units focus on the use of language as it relates to pragmatics, speech acts, and contextualized discourse situations.

The course development process for designing these units on pragmatics and the speech act of apologizing consisted of six interrelated and interchangeable phases (Graves, 2000).

1. The first phase was to evaluate the students' skill levels and determine their familiarity with pragmatics and speech acts in English; however, because this project will not have actual student participants, the students' levels were based

on the description provided above in the previous section of this chapter. Normally, with actual participants, the initial evaluation is done through the use of a DCT and/or questionnaire at the outset of the course. The purpose of this phase is to help the teacher better prepare the lessons and keep the materials accessible according to the students' current skill levels. This phase of the process will also help access student prior knowledge and schema by asking them to think about what they currently know and understand about pragmatics, contextual factors, speech acts, and apologies.

2. The second phase in this curriculum design process was to formulate the main goals of the entire curriculum, along with the goals for each unit and the objectives for each lesson. The unit and lesson goals reflect the main curriculum goals. The main goals for the overall curriculum are that students will understand the concept of pragmatics and will reflect on how pragmatic competence is an important aspect of second language learning; students will understand the concepts of speech acts and speech act routines; students will identify and analyze contextual factors that affect word meaning and influence speech acts; students will be able to identify and perform speech act routines in ways that are viewed as socially and culturally appropriate based on discourse situations and related context.
3. The third phase in this process was conceptualizing content as per each lesson. During this phase the lessons were planned and laid out. The necessary content for each lesson was established according to complexity and the need to scaffold the learning. For the first unit, it was established that the content would be

concepts in pragmatics, including contextual factors affecting discourse situations, politeness principles, and categorizing examples of different types of speech acts. The second unit focuses on the speech act of apologizing, including strategies, routines, and conventional phrases. The activities and student tasks were formulated based on the content, goals and objectives, and the need to scaffold the learning according to complexity and new material.

4. The fourth phase was to develop the materials needed to enhance each lesson. The materials were based on the activities and student tasks that were operationalized for each lesson. The intent of the materials was to support the activities and tasks while meeting the objectives of each lesson.
5. The fifth phase was to organize the units and lessons so as to scaffold the learning by introducing the easier concepts and materials first, followed by the more complex and difficult modules later in each unit.
6. The sixth phase of the curriculum design process was designing an assessment plan that would be valid and reliable and based on the content and materials that were provided to the students during the lessons. Assessment allows the teacher to discern how much actual learning and comprehension is taking place in the classroom and which students might be in need of more assistance. Assessments occurred throughout each unit and were in multiple forms, including a final assessment, or post-test, at the end of the course. As in the beginning of the course, the post-test was added to evaluate student development in terms of understanding pragmatic speech acts routines in English. This assessment was in the form of a DCT and was exactly the same as the pre-test. By using the same

test, the teacher gauges how much change or improvement in understanding happens for each student. In addition, at the end of the unit on apologizing, there is a role play activity used to assess the students understanding and use of apology routines. A rubric was created for the purpose of evaluating the role plays. The language competencies that were evaluated and listed on the rubric were Fluency, Accuracy, and Appropriateness.

The six phases for creating these units on pragmatics and speech acts and making apologies was intended to be flexible and holistic and did not have to be linear. This means that each phase was returned to and reexamined as necessary according to student needs and time constraints (Graves, 2000).

For this unit, there was a lesson design template (see Appendix A) that was utilized for each lesson and included the main learning goals and what the students were expected to understand. The template also outlined the lesson objectives that could reasonably be achieved in each lesson and related to the main unit goal. It also included the lesson content and prompts for promoting student thinking about the content. There was also a description of the assessments during each lesson in the form of exams, tasks, or questionnaires. It also included space for teacher evaluations of student comprehension by way of observation and class notes. Finally, the design template listed the learning activities and student tasks along with the estimated time it would take to accomplish each activity or task. The lesson design template was designed as the basis for creating, setting up, and implementing the lessons for these units. In tune with the course design process, the lesson template was structured, yet, adjustable according to changes in student needs and any time constraints.

Summary

In this chapter I described the project in more detail by describing its basic pedagogical framework and the teaching methods that were utilized in each curriculum unit. I described the EFL setting as I experienced it working as an EFL teacher and related it to the setting intended for this curriculum. I also defined and described the typical EFL student that I feel would be the most likely to take a course in pragmatics and speech acts. I also gave a description of what the pragmatics course and units were like, as well as a description of the course design process and the lesson design template that was used to structure and create the lessons for the unit. The timeline needed for teaching the curriculum units on pragmatics, speech acts, and apologies was also described. In this chapter, in response to my original topic question, I have elucidated what a curriculum unit in instructional pragmatics for teaching and learning the speech act of apologizing in English would look like in an EFL environment.

In the next chapter, I will reflect critically about the process of creating this curriculum development project intended to enhance awareness about pragmatics and speech acts in the EFL setting. I will discuss possible implications for developing similar curriculums for EFL teaching and learning. I will also discuss the literature that was the most valuable toward creating this project. Finally, I will discuss some of the limitations of this project and how future projects can be improved.

CHAPTER FOUR

CRITICAL REFLECTION

Introduction

The intent of this capstone project is the advancement of instructional pragmatics as a component of interlanguage pragmatic development. More specifically, the focus is on operationalizing instructional pragmatics in an EFL teaching and learning environment in order to enhance the pragmatic competence of adult ELs when performing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English. The following question best iterates this undertaking: What might an instructional pragmatics curriculum for adult EFL learners look like? This curriculum development project was designed as a speaking skills course consisting of several lessons for intermediate to advanced level ELs in an EFL environment using research-based instructional techniques focused on improving interlanguage pragmatic competence when producing the expressive speech act of apologizing in English.

In this chapter I will reflect on what I have learned as a researcher, writer, and teacher, and learner in the process of creating this capstone project intended to advance instructional pragmatics for EFL teaching and learning programs. I will also discuss the literature that had the most impact on my work and was the most useful in designing my project. I will then discuss possible implications for this work, including any policy implications in applying this project to EFL programs. In addition, I will examine the limitations of this project. I will also consider any similar future projects that would be

worthwhile pursuing in the area of instructional pragmatics and EFL, and I will offer some recommendations for creating related projects. And I will consider possible ways of communicating about this project to stakeholders who might be interested in this type of project such as EFL program administrators and other EFL teachers. Finally, I will explain how this project is a benefit to English language teaching in English learners.

What I Have Learned

The first thing that I learned as a result of researching this topic and creating this project is the cumulative research that is available but not sufficiently utilized in English language programs, textbooks, and curriculums, and lessons. Research in pragmatics, interlanguage pragmatics, and instructional pragmatics has been ongoing for over decades and the results of the studies show that it is possible and beneficial to teach pragmatics, explicitly or implicitly, in much the same way that we teach grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. However, the movement to implement pragmatics lessons in the classroom is happening at a snail's pace or not at all. From a research perspective the concepts of pragmatics and speech acts is very well known; however, from a strictly teaching and learning perspective, there is very little implementation of the methods recommended by the research. As an EFL teacher researcher, the opportunity to implement pragmatics in the classroom is open and inviting; however, it would require finding a program that would be willing to allow integrating pragmatics into the curriculum or syllabus already in place.

Through the creation of this capstone project, I have also learned that creating a core curriculum around pragmatics concepts and speech acts is a doable endeavor and that it could be expanded and operationalized in many different contexts such as colleges,

universities, private language programs, even EFL high school programs. By devising units and lessons on pragmatics and speech acts, I could see from the outcome of this project that the endeavor is realistic in scope and does not necessitate any hard to acquire or manage teaching materials. The materials needed fall in line with normal teaching materials but with a slightly less than usual approach to using them. From this vantage point, I think this approach to teaching English would be refreshing and interesting for any intermediate to advanced EL in any English language learning environment.

As far as my more personal learning experience during this process, I have learned that I can be a curriculum developer and that developing a curriculum that is comprehensive and research-based is worth the effort and time preparing. I feel this process of creating a curriculum development project that aligns with my beliefs as a teacher has helped me become more confident as a designer of curriculums in general. I used to think that curriculum design and lesson preparation were "not my forte;" however, creating this project has helped me build confidence in my ability to be an effective and thoughtful developer and planner.

Also, during this process, I have come to appreciate more my abilities as a writer. Although the writing process felt very demanding at times, I also feel it is a struggle that is worth the effort and has valuable implications for my future endeavors as a researcher, teacher, and person with ideas and interests. I feel more confident to use the writing skills I have developed and apply them to other projects that might be fitting in terms of career and personal growth.

Finally, through this process of research and development in language teaching and learning, I have learned that I have something to contribute to the field and that my contributions are worthwhile and could be utilized in my next phase as an EFL teacher.

The Literature Review

For this project I did considerable reading about pragmatics and contextual factors that affect discourse; speech acts and how speech acts are categorized, analyzed, and compared across languages; interlanguage pragmatics and how pragmatic competence is acquired; and instructional pragmatics and what that entails when teaching and learning English as a second or foreign language. All of the literature that I covered was useful in that it created a well-rounded point of view for my understanding, writing, and project development.

In order to learn about concepts in pragmatics and especially speech acts, there were many authors and resources that I came to rely on for useful and well-developed information (for example Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Brown & Levinson, 1987; CARLA, 2018; Cutting, 2008; Grice, 1969; Hinkel, 1996; Huang, 2014; Kasper, 2001; Kondo, 2010; LoCastro, 2013; Rose, 2005; Searle, 1976; Spencer-Oatey & Jiang, 2003; Taguchi, 2018; Takahashi, 2010). These resources established for me the basis for my understanding of how pragmatic competence is acquired, how it is viewed according to language and culture, and why it should be taught in EFL programs.

The most useful research for the process of creating my curriculum and lessons was the information on instructional pragmatics and explicitly teaching speech acts. The resource that I found most useful for this was the book by Ishihara & Cohen (2010) that laid out detailed explanations and examples of how lessons in pragmatics could be

implemented. The research information in this particular book was neatly compartmentalized and was easy to use as a reference guide during my curriculum development process. The authors also discussed how teacher knowledge, beliefs, and practice, as well as student subjectivity can sometimes negatively impact the teaching and learning of pragmatics and suggested ways that these obstacles can be dealt with. Although I was not able to apply all that I learned about instruction for pragmatics from this book and other similar resources (for example Alcon Soler, 2008; Asassfeh, Khwaileh, Al-Shaboul, & Alshboul, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003; Hinkel, 2014; Krulatz, 2014; Limberg, 2015; LoCastro, 2013; Martinez-Flor & Beltran-Palanques, 2014; Martinez-Flor, 2016; Roever, 2011; Taguchi, 2015; Takahashi, 2010) into the design of my curriculum, there were many useful ideas, tools, and suggestions that helped me through the curriculum development process.

The research materials that I studied regarding task-based learning and communicative language teaching were also very useful in helping me design my curriculum project because they provided an array of options to choose from in order to accommodate the skill level of the learners (for example Celce-Murcia, 2014; ChavarrIa & Bonany, 2006; Duff, 2014; Ellis, 2000, 2014; Gilmore, 2007; Hinkel, 2006; Lazaraton, 2014; Neff & Rucynski Jr, 2013; Parrish, 2006). By combining pragmatics research and instructional pragmatics approaches with task-based learning and CLT, I was able to create a curriculum that can be more easily applied to programs that are already using task-based learning and CLT in their curriculums.

Learning about pragmatics and how to teach it to English learners was an adventure in finding research, resources, and materials. The resources and materials I encountered

were expansive, yet, focused while being novel, yet, reliable and predictable. The major studies that I relied on were insightful and added something new to my learning as well as my teaching repertoire. All of the resources and materials that I encountered contributed something useful to my understanding of EL teaching and learning of pragmatics and speech acts.

Implications for Research and Project

The biggest implication for this curriculum development project that involves teaching and learning pragmatics and speech acts is that it requires expanding traditional EFL curriculums to include a level of linguistics that is not ordinarily taught in an explicit way in EFL classrooms. This involves adjusting curriculums that usually focus on pronunciation (phonology and phonetics), vocabulary (morphology and semantics), and grammar (syntax) to include more detailed instruction about language use in context (pragmatics). In order for regular EFL programs to allow pragmatics instruction, it might mean a change in policy regarding what standard EFL instruction looks like. It is my hope that EFL program administrators around the world take a deeper look at pragmatics as an instructional topic. I think that they will find that it is a level of language competence that is just as important as the other well-established competencies which will motivate them to design, implement, and utilize new curriculums. With just a slight increase in insight and awareness, program administrators will see how pragmatic competence is also a necessity that requires focus in the classroom. I believe as more efforts to introduce pragmatics into EFL language programs persist, it will become a more mainstream approach and instruction in pragmatics will develop and improve as its use is increased.

Limitations of this Curriculum Project

I think the first limitation of this curriculum project focused on pragmatics and speech acts for EFL learners is that it is geared toward adult intermediate to advanced level learners. Based on the explicit instructions regarding pragmatics and speech acts that I created as part of the lessons for this project, I feel it would best be taught to more advanced learners and not early learners or beginning level learners. I think it would be valuable to teach pragmatics to young learners and beginning learners; however, it would mean taking a different approach in terms of how the teacher instruction time would be implemented. Personally, I am not as familiar with teaching young and beginning level English learners, but I believe assuredly that someone with that experience could devise an instructional pragmatics curriculum that would benefit them. I think part of the solution to this limitation would be to offer the current instructional pragmatics curriculum as a teacher development course to experienced EFL English teachers who work with young and beginning level learners. A teacher development course with a focus on pragmatics instruction will help them create a curriculum for their students that would be age and level appropriate. Since my project is geared toward intermediate to advanced level learners, offering this course to EFL teachers of English as a development plan would help bring this subject matter and approach to more learners by virtue of exposing more teacher learners to the concepts of pragmatics, especially contextual factors, politeness principles, and speech act routines. This exposure would narrow the limitations of this type of curriculum project and broaden the audience.

Another limitation of this curriculum project is that it is geared toward the EFL environment only. Although it could be adjusted to fit an ESL teaching and learning

environment, it would be necessary to fit it according to individual ESL programs and the learners in those programs. The general learning environment for ESL has different needs and students usually have different goals and motivations compared to EFL learners. I believe presenting a curriculum that is focused on pragmatics and speech acts would be beneficial for all ESL learners; however, the approach would have to be attuned to meet their needs, preferences, and interests.

The limitations of this project are related to learner skill levels and program needs; however, as in any teaching and learning situation, curriculums with specific content and approaches that are useful for acquiring English can be adjusted to adequately fit all learners needs and all program environments. I think this curriculum project could also be fairly easily adjusted for different learners and programs.

Future Projects and Recommendations

In the future I envision similar curriculums that endeavor to advance instructional pragmatics in order to advance learners' interlanguage pragmatic development. Similar future projects would include more examples of types of speech acts, demonstrate more speech act routines, offer comprehensive examples of conventional phrases for speech act performance, and show additional examples of realistic speech act situations, including corpus-based real-life examples from English language corpus data. Future projects could also focus on improving evaluation and assessment tools for rating pragmatic knowledge and competence. It is my recommendation that instructional pragmatics curriculums in the future rely on ongoing and up-to-date research in pragmatics concepts such as implicature and indirect speech, sociocultural norms and contextual factors, politeness principles, speech act routines, and conventional phrases used to perform

speech acts. Relying on research in these areas will be beneficial to creating well-rounded curriculums and lessons for instructional pragmatics.

In order to increase the number of instructional pragmatics curriculums in language learning environments, it is necessary to reach out to the people who have the largest stake in improving English language teaching and learning programs. These people would be program administrators, language teachers, and language learners. One way of communicating the idea of teaching pragmatics as a core concept in language learning would be to publish articles related to the topic. However, that might not reach the biggest audience since peer-reviewed articles are read mainly by other researchers. In order to reach more administrators, teachers, and students, it might be necessary for current teachers to develop understanding about pragmatics through ongoing training. These teachers can then introduce pragmatics concepts gradually into their lessons. This approach will help "test the waters" and provide insight into how well instruction in pragmatics fits into standard language programs as they exist today. In order to get teachers to attend training sessions on instructional pragmatics, it might be necessary to submit proposals to TESOL related organizations and, hopefully, create the opportunity to train teachers on approaches to teaching pragmatics. Becoming a teacher trainer in instructional pragmatics is one option for advancing this topic and helping it become more mainstream. Communicating about instructional pragmatics and encouraging the use of this approach through writings and trainings may lead language teachers to having a greater appreciation of pragmatic competence as a core language skill. Hopefully, communicating this need will lead to more programs that incorporate pragmatics into their curriculum.

Benefits to English Language Learning

The current project benefits the field of English language teaching and learning because it introduces learners to new ways of thinking about discourse and the factors that influence everyday discourse in their L2. This type of curriculum exposes ELs to new ideas about why conversations in English can be so demanding or confusing. They will learn that it is not just their linguistic ability, or inability, that determines their overall competence. They will realize that there are other levels of language that are at play when they are interacting with others and using English as their second or other language. Language use in context, contextual factors that affect meaning, social rules and cultural norms, politeness principles, speech act categories and types of speech acts, and conventional speech act routines are all areas of understanding that, when implemented in an appropriate, student-oriented way, can assist language learners in developing the knowledge and awareness they need to further their language development. Instructional pragmatics and the approaches it endorses can assist students in acquiring language skills beyond literal word meaning and sentence structure. Instructional pragmatics gives them a framework for studying some of the more complex attributes of language and leads them to acquire language in a more comprehensive and comprehensible way.

Summary

In this chapter I discussed what I learned as a researcher, writer, teacher and learner. I took another look at the literature that I researched in order to develop this capstone project and mentioned the resources that had the biggest impact on the process of completing this project. I also explained the implications that this curriculum project has

on EFL programs and how it would mean expanding those programs to include instructional pragmatics lessons. I also discussed the limitations of this curriculum development project and how these limitations can be corrected. I also looked at how future projects could be expanded and developed in order to increase knowledge about pragmatics and instructional pragmatics approaches. I also included some ideas on how this type of project could be promoted within the field of English language teaching and learning. Finally, I explained how this curriculum development project for advancing instructional pragmatics benefits teaching and learning English.

Through this entire process of researching, reading, writing, planning, and creating, I have come to appreciate the areas of study that I chose to focus on which are pragmatics in general and teaching by way of instructional pragmatics. I have also realized that by focusing on a topic that is meaningful to me and beneficial to others, I am doing my small part to improve the field of English language teaching and learning. This realization encourages me to expand on what I have learned and continue to improve myself as a researcher, writer, and teacher. It is my goal to implement the knowledge and experience that I have acquired throughout this process in my future classrooms in a way that is useful, meaningful, productive, enlightening, and inspiring for my students.

REFERENCES

Alcon Soler, E. (2008). Investigating pragmatic language learning in foreign language classrooms. *IRAL, International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 46*(3), 173-195.

Asassfeh, S. M., Khwaileh, F. M., Al-Shaboul, Y. M., & Alshboul, S. S. (2012). Communicative language teaching in an EFL context: Learners' attitudes and perceived implementation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(3), 525-535.

Aubrecht, K. M. (2013). *Helping English learners make pragmatically appropriate requests.* Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_all/521/

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2014). Documenting interlanguage development. In Z. Han, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Interlanguage: Forty years later* (pp. 127-146). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning*, *49*(4), 677-713.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dornyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(2), 233-262.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System, 33*(3), 401-415.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Teaching pragmatics. Washington DC: US Department of State Office of English Language Programs.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Vellenga, H. E. (2012). The effect of instruction on conventional expressions in L2 pragmatics. *System, 40*(1), 77-89.

Bergmann, A., Currie Hall, K., & Ross, S. M. (Eds.). (2007). *Language files* (Tenth ed.). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics, 5*(3), 196-213.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bu, J. (2012). A study of the effects of explicit and implicit teachings on developing Chinese EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *International Journal of Language Studies, 6*(3), 57-80.

CARLA - The Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. (2018). Pragmatics and speech acts. Retrieved from http://carla.umn.edu/speechacts/index.html

Celce-Murcia, M. (2014). Teaching English in the context of world Englishes. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language.* (Fourth ed., pp. 63-70). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning, a part of Cengage Learning.

Chang, Y. (2010). 'I no say you say is boring': The development of pragmatic competence in L2 apology. *Language Sciences, 32*(3), 408-424.

Chang, Y. (2011). Interlanguage pragmatic development: The relation between pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. *Language Sciences, 33*(5), 786-798.

ChavarrIa, M. I., & Bonany, E. B. (2006). Raising awareness of pragmatics in the EFL classroom: A proposal. *Cultura, Lenguaje Y Representacion: Revista De Estudios Culturales De La Universitat Jaume I, 3*, 133-144.

Chen, X. (2017). An investigation of the relationship between pragmatic competence and motivation for non-English majors. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(12), 1308-1314.

Cheng, D. (2017). Communication is a two-way street: Instructors' perceptions of student apologies. *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association, 27*(1), 1-32.

Cohen, A. D., Olshtain, E., & Rosenstein, D. S. (1986). Advanced EFL apologies: What remains to be learned? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 1986*(62), 51-74.

Cutting, J. (2008). *Pragmatics and discourse* (Second ed.). London: Routledge.

Duff, P. A. (2014). Communicative language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (Fourth ed., pp. 15-30). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning, a part of Cengage Learning.

Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 193-220.

Ellis, R. (2014). Principles of instructed second language learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (Fourth ed., pp. 31-45). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning, a part of Cengage Learning.

Eurostat. (2017). Foreign language learning statistics. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Foreign_language_learning_statistics

Eyring, J. L. (2014). Adult learners in English as a second/foreign language settings. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (Fourth ed., pp. 568-583). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning, a part of Cengage Learning.

Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching, 40*(2), 97-118.

Glaser, K. (2013). The neglected combination: A case for explicit-inductive instruction in teaching pragmatics in ESL. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada, 30*(7), 150-163.

Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers*. Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Grice, H. P. (1969). Utterer's meaning and intention. *The Philosophical Review, 78*(2), 147-177.

Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System, 39*(2), 240-250.

Hinkel, E. (1994). Pragmatics of interaction: Expressing thanks in a second language. *Applied Language Learning, 5*(1), 73-91.

Hinkel, E. (1996). When in Rome: Evaluations of L2 pragmalinguistic behaviors. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26*(1), 51-70.

Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 109-131.

Hinkel, E. (2014). Culture and pragmatics in language teaching and learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language.* (Fourth ed., pp. 394-408). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning, a part of Cengage Learning.

Holtgraves, T. (2007). Second language learners and speech act comprehension. *Language Learning, 57*(4), 595-610.

Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics* (Second ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ifantidou, E., & Tzanne, A. (2012). Levels of pragmatic competence in an EFL academic context: A tool for assessment. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 9*(1), 47-70.

Illes, E., & Akcan, S. (2017). Bringing real-life language use into EFL classrooms. *ELT Journal, 71*(1), 3-12.

Intachakra, S. (2004). Contrastive pragmatics and language teaching: Apologies and thanks in English and Thai. *RELC Journal: A Journal of Language Teaching and Research in Southeast Asia, 35*(1), 37-62.

Ishihara, N. (2006). *Subjectivity, second/foreign language pragmatic use, and instruction: Evidence of accommodation and resistance. study I. emulating and resisting pragmatic norms: Learner subjectivity and foreign language pragmatic use. study II. centering second language (SL) speakers' experience: A study of SL speakers' resistance to pragmatic norms of the SL community. study III. web-based curriculum for pragmatics instruction in Japanese as a foreign language: An explicit awareness-raising approach* Available from Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA). (85644908; 200706328).

Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 4*(10), 938-953.

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(4), 502-530.

Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*(2), 149-169.

Kim, H. (2016). An investigation into EFL learners' perception towards L2 pragmatic instruction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(3), 452-462.

Kondo, S. (2010). Apologies: Raising learners' cross-cultural awareness. In Alicia Martínez Flor, Esther Usó Juan (Ed.), *Speech act performance: Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues* (pp. 145-162). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Krulatz, A. (2014). Integrating pragmatics instruction in a content-based classroom. *ORTESOL Journal, 31*, 19-25.

Lai, H. T. (2013). Learning English as an international language: EFL learners' perceptions of cultural knowledge acquisition in the English classroom. *Asian Social Science, 10*(1), 1-11.

Lazaraton, A. (2014). Second language speaking. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (Fourth ed., pp. 106-120). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning, a part of Cengage Learning.

Limberg, H. (2015). Principles for pragmatics teaching: Apologies in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal: English Language Teaching Journal, 69*(3), 275-285.

LoCastro, V. (2013). *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Martinez-Flor, A. (2016). Teaching apology formulas at the discourse level: Are instructional effects maintained over time? *Elia,* (16), 13-48.

Martinez-Flor, A., & Beltran-Palanques, V. (2014). The role of politeness in apology sequences: How to maintain harmony between speakers. *Elia*, (14), 43-66.

Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, *41*(3), 315-348.

Neff, P., & Rucynski Jr, J. (2013). Tasks for integrating language and culture teaching. Paper presented at the *English Teaching Forum,* Washington, DC. *, 51*(2) 12-23.

Padilla Cruz, M. (2013). Understanding and overcoming pragmatic failure in intercultural communication: From focus on speakers to focus on hearers. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 51*(1), 23-54.

Pakir, A. (1999). Connecting with English in the context of internationalisation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(1), 103-114.

Parrish, B. (2006). *Teaching adult ESL: A practical introduction*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill ESL/ELT.

Parrish, B. (2015). *Meeting the language needs of today's adult English language learner: Issue brief.* Washington, DC: Literacy Information and Communication System (LINCS).

Rao, Z., & Yuan, H. (2016). Employing native-English-speaking teachers in China: Benefits, problems and solutions. *English Today, 32*(4), 12-18.

Roever, C. (2011). Testing of second language pragmatics: Past and future. *Language Testing, 28*(4), 463-481.

Ronan, P. (2015). Categorizing expressive speech acts in the pragmatically annotated SPICE Ireland corpus. *ICAME Journal, 39*(1), 25.

Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(1), 27-67.

Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System, 33*(3), 385-399.

Rose, K. R. (2009). Interlanguage pragmatic development in Hong Kong, phase 2. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(11), 2345-2364.

Savignon, S. J. (1987). Communicative language teaching. *Theory into Practice*, *26*(4), 235-242.

Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*(2), 261-278.

Savignon, S. J., & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 41*(3), 223-249.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5*(1), 1-23.

Shahrokhi, M., & Shirani Bidabadi, F. (2013). An overview of politeness theories: Current status, future orientations. *American Journal of Linguistics, 2*(2), 17-27.

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Jiang, W. (2003). Explaining cross-cultural pragmatic findings: Moving from politeness maxims to sociopragmatic interactional principles (SIPs). *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*(10-11), 1633-1650.

Taguchi, N. (2008). The role of learning environment in the development of pragmatic comprehension: A comparison of gains between EFL and ESL learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 30*(4), 423-452.

Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 289-310.

Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching, 48*(1), 1-50.

Taguchi, N. (2018). Contexts and pragmatics learning: Problems and opportunities of the study abroad research. *Language Teaching, 51*(1), 124-137.

Takahashi, S. (2010). The effect of pragmatic instruction on speech act performance. In Alicia Martínez-Flor, & Esther Usó-Juan (Eds.), *Speech act performance:*

Theoretical, empirical and methodological issues (pp. 126-142). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Tarone, E. (2014). Enduring questions from the interlanguage hypothesis. In Z. Han, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Interlanguage: Forty years later* (pp. 7-26). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

The British Council. (2013). *The English Effect: The impact of English, what it's worth to the UK, and why it matters to the world.* Cambridge, UK: The British Council. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/english-effect-report-v2.pdf

Urgilés, G. E. H., & Villacreces, J. J. (2017). English pragmatics in Ecuador. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(9), 723-728.

Valipour, S., & Jadidi, S. (2015). Study of Iranian English language teachers' familiarity with language functions in request, apology, refusal, and greeting. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 4*(1), 13-30.

Vellenga, H. E. (2008). *Instructional effectiveness and interlanguage pragmatics* Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (275902800).

Wyatt, M. (2014). Saying sorry in advance for not turning up: A study of EFL teachers' text messages. *English Today: The International Review of the English Language, 30*(1), 48-54.

Yan, L., & Zhuang, Y. (2010). Reflections on the nature of pragmatic failure. *US-China Foreign Language, 8*(1), 1-7. Youn, S. J. (2015). Validity argument for assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction using mixed methods. *Language Testing, 32*(2), 199-225.

Yu, M. (1999). Universalistic and culture-specific perspectives on variation in the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. *Pragmatics Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA), 9*(2), 281-312.

APPENDIX A

Sample of lesson design template

Course Title: Understanding Pragmatics and Speech Acts in English
Unit Goals:
Lesson Objectives:
Lesson Content:
Activities/Tasks:
Assessment:
Teacher observations/notes:

APPENDIX B

Course Syllabus

Course Number: **English 111**
Course Title: **Pragmatics and Speech Acts in English**
Course Dates: **September 3-December 21, 2018**
Course Time: **Monday-Wednesday-Friday, 9:00-9:50 am**

Instructor: Bridget Borer
Phone: 0123-4567-8999
Email: borer@EFLuniversity.edu
Office: English Studies Building, Room 222
Office Hours: Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 13:00-14:00

Course Description: Pragmatics is the study of language use in context. The context is the place, the time, the situation, and the people who are using the language. Becoming a fluent speaker of English as a foreign language requires knowing how to use language forms (words, phrases, sentences) as well as understanding the social and cultural norms of English-speaking countries (the UK, the USA, Canada, Australia).

Speech acts are expressions (spoken or written) that are related to an action or behavior. There are many different types of speech acts. For example, saying *Hello* to someone is the speech act of **greeting**, saying *Thank you* is the speech act of showing **gratitude**, saying *Goodbye* is the speech act of saying **farewell**, and saying *I'm sorry* is the speech act of **apologizing**.

In this course you will study pragmatics, social and cultural context, politeness, and many different types of speech acts in relation to English-speaking societies and cultures.

Course Content and Goals: In this class you will observe and review many different types of speech acts and learn the true meaning of a speech act based on the context, the people, and the culture. You will learn about the social rules and cultural norms of English-speaking countries and how to perform speech acts based on those norms. You will think and discuss about speech acts in your language and culture and compare them to English. You will perform speech acts in English during class and practice socially and culturally appropriate language forms when using speech acts in conversation in English. You will be assessed on your understanding of pragmatics and speech act behavior in English.

Assignments:
Pragmatics and Speech Acts Journal – 25 points
Role Play dialogue – 15 points

Transcription and analysis of video – 10 points
Midterm Exam – 25 points
Final Exam – 25 points

Schedule:

Unit	Content	Goals
Unit 1	**-Pre-test/DCT** -Pragmatics -Contextual factors -Politeness -Speech act groups -Types of speech acts	-Understand basic concepts of Pragmatics -Understand contextual factors -Understand politeness concepts -Understand different groups and types of speech acts -Identify different speech acts
Unit 2	Greetings	Understand and use expressions and routines for greeting others in English.
Unit 3	Farewells	Understand and use expressions and routines for ending conversations and saying goodbye in English.
Unit 4	Thanks	Understand and use expressions and routines for showing gratitude/thanking in English.
Unit 5	Invitations	Understand and use expressions and routines for offering invitations in English.
Unit 6	Requests	Understand and use expressions and routines for making requests in English.
Unit 7	Refusals	Understand and use expressions and routines for refusing requests in English.
Unit 8	Apologies	Understand and use expressions and routines for making apologies in English.
Unit 9	Compliments	Understand and use expressions and routines for giving compliments in English.
Unit 10	Compliment Responses	Understand and use expressions and routines for responding to compliments in English.
Unit 11	Complaints	Understand and use expressions and routines for making complaints in English.
Unit 12	Advice	Understand and use expressions and routines for giving advice in English.
Review	**Final Exams**	**Post-test/DCT**